Preserve

App F IX-4

1930-31
(Mic)

File No 31-30
Serial Nos. 60-65

Previous References
LB 26-26-163
LF 161-92

Later References
Law 120-36-1-4
Ls 52-55 a 16
Uff 380 T Bdg

PRESERVED

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos Six

Part B for August 1934

SUBJECT.

Purchase by the Zintahaki municipality of the rights of the Sri Rameswara temple at Zintahaki over the income portion of the municipality

1265.

G.O No L 1462-6/ Mil 31-30-65 dated 28/8/34

To. The Municipal Comr
WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34
Dve D.C Trincomalee
The Comptroller Local Fd
The Deputy Dir of Land Records.

Pass over retn

14/8/35

Form No: I

Memorandum of Subjects proposed for discussion in the Dasara session of the Representative Assembly for the Shimoga District

---

GENERAL & REVENUE SECRETARIAT
29 SEP 1926
MYSORE GOVT. MANUSCRIPTS

For Dasara Session of Representative Assembly 1926

Ind 81-26 3

No: 1	Subject	Summary of Representation
	Dispensing the ~~annual~~ payment of the present amount of Chatarpha collected in the Inam portion of the Tirthahalli Municipality to the Rameswara Temple at Tirthahalli.	At present the Sri Rameswara Temple at Tirthahalli is being paid ¾ of the Chatarfe collected in the Inam portion of the Tirthahalli Municipality and the other ¼ is credited to the Municipality. This proportion might be reversed as the Municipality is growing in importance and more money is required to meet the urgent needs of the Municipality.

Name of Member :-

Mr. B. Gopalachar,
Tirthahalli Taluk.

ER

Admit
(Intd) DR
21/9

Previous references relating to the Subject :-

G.O. No: 18648-7/L.F. 161-92 dated 3rd May 1894.

Remarks by the Deputy Commissioner :-

The above proportion was fixed in G.O. No: 18648-7/L.F. 161-92 dated 3rd May 1894.

~~As regards~~ The Question of reversing the proportion as proposed by the Assembly will have to be referred to the Panchayetdars of the Inam and the Municipal Deputy Commissioner ~~is requested~~ requested to ~~him~~ his opinion will have to be ascertained.

24/9

30/9/26 (Illegible)

DC

G. H. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

I shall be glad if L-L.
Secy will please draw
the Draft; & submit
a Considered Note before R.B. meets
The needs seem
to be to buy up the
Mahajans rights in the
Temple for the Trustees,
their Guru & Manager Contribution

3798
4/10

Rec'd 8/10/26

Agreement

10e
3/10/26

Rajan 8/10

Sd
A.D.

Law Secy)

3 Please ask Mr Rangachari &
Lt Col Menzies if any action
subject - May Kindly be treated
as Confidential

8/10

4 It is ascertained that no such a
Fee is leviable in the Municipal Branch

5 Please putting this original
10/26 File

8/10

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be pasted, or slips pasted on this form

3

G R S III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record]

6. Regarding the redirection of the
question of Maharaja payable
to the Archeevaru Temple at Muttukulli &
Collector with the view perhaps of the Muttukulli
Munsif.

7. The Joint Member wanted the Mysore
file on the subject. The Registrar says
that there is no file on the subject
in that Branch

8 The only papers available in the
printed Copy of G.O. No 1864 6-7/dt 9th
1861-62 & 3757 1854 passing orders allowing
3/4 to Maharaja & the Munsif. From the original
file it must first be communicated

9 It will be seen from the G.O. Book No. 1
that Mr Nelharachar as Deputy Collector in 1885
tried to withdraw the temple Archagat & Emoluments
& his being assigned to the Mirasi & Pariah
he failed therein & Court witness the Omalhagaddam
& Sarvadhikari only 1/4 (vide para of his letter read
with the proceedings). Though in his letter of
17/7/1893, his successor recommended the payment
to the Trust of 1/2 the Maharaja, the first in the
above order treated the reversion of only 1/4th.
It was added thereto that subject to approval the
Municipality the entire Maharaja Collection
in Theru was under just Consideration & orders
would issue in due course.

N B- Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must de copied, or slips pasted on this form. M D 1880- C P B- 1 50 000- 2 5 21

10 The papers relating to
further correspondence on the subject
are not available here

GRS III—3]

Routine Notes

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record]

11. Lately the Jain-Mattâdh
Swamiar of Sravanabelagola has addressed to
Government through the Maharaja from
the Sravanabelagola Mundi this
thing that magisterial orders
have been passed disregarding the
mandates of the right to ~~attach~~
the enjoyment of the Cars
in Municipalities where they
have a right. The Sravanabelagola
Mutt has surrendered its rights
recently for the Court to
of the privilege of ~~nominating~~
~~a~~ having a Vice in the Nomination
of the Chairman of the Municipality
of Nagar

12 The Member has not to state that
the remedy in this case seems to
be to bring up the Maharaja
rights of the Temple for the
Mutt, first a Mutt Committee

13) It is not known whether
the Temple has got any other income
& what that amounts to. The
expenditure in 1887-88 was said
to amount to Rs 67-6-8 which
the income from ~~Nagar~~ share of
Maharaja amounts to only
Rs 67-10-11
It is not
known what the present expenditure
is & also the present Maharaja
attached

N B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

5

C 161/17-10-26 14244

GRS III—31

Routine Notes

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record]

Then the question seems to be necessary before the question of Ist or 2nd Charge with Ruler on account of protection of Maharaja rights is considered

~~Hodgson to Mr. Dickinson~~

14) The result of discussion with Govt may be communicated also in the meantime a reply may perhaps be given that the matter will be investigated.

L Price)
Secretary

17/10

15) In the recent D.C's case it was held that when Govt abolish Maharaja rights of Jagirdars to Maharaja as Lease is to submit a note this might be placed & accordg

4280/17/10

16) The Minister

17) N B—Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

It is unfortunately ascertained from the
P A Section that this subject was not taken up till 11.
for discussion for want of time and so the
object in is I called for this case & not disposed

6

GRS III—3]

Routine Notes

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record]

18)

The matter seems to be under consideration separately with the chief ~~Engr~~ Secy. The press may perhaps also be heard on that file

NS 19) Mr La Touche's letter 17/- up after the speech regarding Navigation of Brahmaputra is worked

NS
1892

1895

N B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

7

G R S III—3]

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent

N B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

C170/7.6.28

L6103

DEWAN'S MINUTE

FILE No. 192

DEWAN'S OFFICE
Received on
5 - JUN 1928
Legislative
Reg No. 1146

C Secy

D 1642

Kindly look up papers, noting if any steps have been taken to separate the Management from Temple funds also the Thirthavalli Nadi is a long-pending question 75% of the Mohtarfa is now credited to the Temple funds & only 25% to the Management. Nadi steps of any things, & the reverse. The report of the Committee appointed to go into the question & make recommendations, has yet to be published

JM
5-6-28

Murrai
Referred
6/6

Rev.
Mem for the attn
MD 6/6

Mur Dept.
6/6

E/6 The matter is receiving consideration in the Murrai Dept and the previous papers in the L.S Sr were sent to the Murrai Br for favour of opinion. This may be transferred to the Murr. Br

AJ 11/6

Transferred to Murrai Dept 8/6

7642 9

Municipal file 81-26 is putting
the Mun. Comm's reply to their open
letter no 2010/mc 81-26 dated
10th May 1928 is due.

BG
11/6/28

Chairman) MD 11/6



In perusal & favour of
further instructions
Second Member MM 12/6 MD
First
Dewan — This may be sub'd to 1st member.

CSV
12/6

mc 7201

Please ask the M C
to send his report soon.
This has to be settled without
further delay MM
12 6 28

Perhaps the remainder
in a reply in this stage.
MD 18/6

Subs with a view to remainder for approval

BG
18/6

MD
18/6

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No 81 of 1926

Serial No

20) Orders have since been passed in G.O. No. L. 4973-5005/ L.B. 26-26-163 dated 27th February 1928 that the levy of Motarfa taxes be abolished in all the villages in the State, (Government, Inam, Janagir). The Ramaswara Temple can no longer levy Mohatarfa in the Inam portion of the Thirthahalli Municipality and the contribution of three-fourths of the Municipal taxes levied in the Inam portion of the Municipality in accordance with the G.O No 18646-7 L F 161-92 dated 3rd May 1894 should therefore cease.

21) Sringeri Municipality is paying one-half of the income to the Sringeri Mutt ard while constituting the area into a Regulation Municipality it has been decided that no portion of the Municipal income need be paid to the Sringeri Mutt and that the Municipal income should be utilised exclusively for Municipal purposes.

22) The income from Mohatarfa to the Rameswara Temple at Sirthahalli under the arrangement approved in the order of 1894 was estimated at Rs. 1328 in the year 1894. Information as to the amount accruing from Mohatarfa taxes to the temple at present is not available. The contribution of taxes raised in the Municipality may form a considerable portion of the income of the temple and its sudden withdrawal may perhaps

Note—Contn sheet

WD 0324—GPB—60,000—24 5 27

1424 9 26 4/

App F III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No 8 (of 192 6

Serial No

prejudice the proper conduct of sevas in the temple and if approved, the existing arrangement may perhaps be cancelled with effect from the beginning of the next official year. The Muzrai Secretariat may also be consulted before final orders are issued

8734
23/4

19/4/28

Fort Munro

22/4

23) There is no legal justification for putting off — but as no reply has been received from the Municipality itself (as this is a great loss to the temple income) there is no objection to the measure taking effect from next official year. May sect may be consulted

24/4

Mungeli

25/4

26-4-28

D 1469

24) The Mun. Com. may be asked to enquire & report what income the temple derived from Mohatsafa for the last three years and in case this income ceases how the temple is to be reimbursed to that extent 25 %

26-4-28

NOTE:— Contd. sheet

WD 0321—GPB —60 000—24-5 27

12

1466 App F III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No 81 of 1926

Serial No

Dft. to the M. C. Submits
A.V. 4/28 with personal explanations
2nd Member 28/4
Mem 28/4/28
h
27) Com
M 1/5/28

To, Mem Coll - No 2010 dt 7.5.28
calls for info as to what amt the temple was getting for Mohatsapa for the last three years in case the income leases have the loss to the temple is to be made good.

From, the M C, Letter no 1503 dt 9.6.28
Reports that the matter was discussed on the occasion of his visit to Jeevan-halli, with the Vice President, some municipal members and D.C. Shimoga and that it was agreed that the municipality should pay to the temple a compensation of Rs 24000,

NOTE—Contn sheet

APR 03
6245
No 16253
01/5/28

WD 0324—GPB—60 000—24 5 27

Serial No

345/27/6

and for the lump-sum payment, the right of the temple over the Padavanahalli part of the town will have to be transferred to the Municipal Council.

x) The M C promises to submit a further report like the resolution of the Municipal council to the above effect, which may perhaps be awaited.

Submitted
A
28/6/29.

OFFICE OF THE [illegible] COUNCIL
10 JULY 1929
NO 260

4

Sms (A)

Note—Contn Sheet

pl copy

Copy as 7/6/29

1st number 4 9/7/29

From, the M C. Letter no 1503 Dt 28.6.29.
Represents the return of the file of vernacular papers on the subject.

xx) Submitted
Ag CE
12.7.29.

To. The Hg Comm
W 0115-D/16-7-29

Returns the ver. Accounts & calls for further report.

14

Gen Ps Mucz 444-28 841

G R S III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES

[To be used only for notes requisitions, etc, not intended for permanent record]

3.1. Proceedings of Parliament.

(October 1930.)

31) Extracts from the above relating to Questions and Answers (including Supplementary Questions & Answers) taken up on the 7th, 8th and 9th October 1930 are forwarded with compliments to the ~~Private~~ Under Secretary to Government.....Financial (Mucz)..... Branch for favour of necessary action.

8/10/30 8/10

8.12.30

32) Linked file Submitted The concerned file Mucz 444-28 for orders

* 15/12 33) Please see file no Mucz 1180 of 30 and note points for ordering

16 12 30

628/141

34) This will be placed with the main file and the questions pursued, Necessary reminders being issued to the Secretariat for the submission of the reply

10/1/31 H Secy 12.1.31

12/1/31

12.1.31

N B – Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

W D 1860—GPB—1 50 000—8 6 21

G R S III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc , not intended for permanent rec

N B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

Muz Dno 154 15

8)—8— 31

Letter No. Muz.1.C.293/27-28 dated 26-7-31 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, (Camp Shiralkoppa), to the General Secretary to Government.

With reference to your letter No. L 9965/M1.31-30-46 dated 16th June 31 calling for a report on the representation of Mr. T Ramanna Gowda, re the dispute between Municipality of Tirthahalli and the Dharmadarsis of Sri Rameswaradevaru temple, I have the honor to state that this question has been pending for a long time as the Survey Superintendent cannot from the records available in his office fix the boundaries of the Inam village and the matter cannot therefore be settled until this is done.

As a number of houses have been built on Inam land, the Municipality has to acquire this extent of land and to pay compensation to the temple. I am in correspondence with the District Survey Officer and as no survey operations, are possible now owing to this heavy monsoon the matter will be taken up after the rains stop When the boundaries of the Inam village are fixed, I shall convene a meeting of Dharmadarsis and the Municipal Councillors and try to come to an amicable settlement

In this connection I may add that it was proposed to the Municipality to pay the temple R 24,000/- as compensation but the Municipality at their meeting deferred the question of payment till the boundaries of the Inam village were determined

---

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore, for information with reference to his letter No 108/30-31 dated 25-5-31.

Sd/- M.S. Mehkri,

Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District

108/30-31
5/8/31

Memo.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Secretary to Government, Financial Department, for favour of information and continuation of this office Memo dated 16-6-31.

Yaccarasingia Rau

For Muzrai Commissioner

Suo
7.8.31

Merfill on the subject was given by me CW 6 the LSG Branch to be submitted for submission with the original of the D.C Shimoga & the Secretary Govt for perusal
7/31

7.8.31

Note.

Mohatarfa - Thirthahalli Town

Rival claims of the Sri Rameswara-swami Temple and the Municipality.

The temple has been enjoying 3/4 of the Mohatarfa collected in the Inam portion of the Thirthahalli Municipality in accordance with G.O. No. 18646/L.F 161-92, dated 3rd May 1894, only 1/4 was being credited to the Municipal Funds.

The Municipality has been urging -- from time to time that it should benefit by the collection of mohatarfa in the Inam portion of Thirthahalli Municipality. In connection with this the First Member -- minuted on 3rd October 1926 as follows:-

" The remedy seems to buy up the mohatarfa rights of the temple for the Municipality, Government and Municipality contributing".

On 5th June 1928 the Dewan directed that the question should be examined and steps taken to separate the Municipal from -- Temple funds. The Muzrai Commissioner -- was thereupon asked to report what income and the temple derived from Mohatarfa in case the income ceased (in accordance with Proceedings of Government in the L.S.G.) how the loss to the temple should be made good. He reported on 19th June 1929 that the matter was discussed on the -- occasion of his visit to Thirthahalli with the Vice President and some Municipal members and the Deputy Commissioner, --

L. 4973-5005/L.B. 26-26-163, dated 27-2-28.

Shimoga, that the Municipality should pay to the temple a compensation of -- Rs. 24,000 in return for which the right of the temple over the Padavanahalli part of the town, would be transferred to the Municipal Council. In this connection the following summary of the points at issue contained in the Shimoga Deputy Commissioner's letter dated 5th April 1929 to the Muzrai Commissioner may perhaps be interesting.--

1. The levy of the Mohataria at Thirthahalli being governed by the order of 3rd May 94, the right of the temple to the share allotted to it therein does not appear to have been cancelled by the G.O. of 28th February 1928 abolishing mohataria in rural areas.

2. The right of the temple, has however its corresponding obligation and since the existing arrangement has placed the Municipality in a disadvantageous position it has to be so modified as to meet the growing needs of the rate payers in regard to sanitation and works of town improvement.

3. To arrive at an equitable arrangement as between the temple and the Municipality there appear but two courses left open to adoption provided the latter body is willing to abide by them:-

The first is for the Municipality to acquire all rights the temple possess and in the inam area by paying a lump sum price. The other remedy lies in enhancing the ratio of the share of the Municipality.

The late Muzrai Commissioner Rajakarya Pravina Mr. P.G. D'Souza had personally discussed the matter with the local authorities as noted supra and the Municipal Council at its meeting

18

held on 29th May 1930 resolved that as the nature, the extent and boundaries of the inam endowed to Sri ~~Rameswara~~ Rameswara are not known, the same may be obtained from the Inam Office for the settlement of this complicated question. Action -- taken later in the matter is embodied in the report under disposal.

Note given for Personal File 31 of 1930-31 - M 50.

S 793/L & S 72/L

Q.S. 8/8/31

36) Note and orders in the Connected file of the L.S.G.

37) The question has been pending for a long time and it is important to settle it without the definite views of the Rd. Council in the matter. The D.C. may be asked to attend a meeting of the Council specially convened for the purpose and see that the question is finally disposed of by the Council.

Submitted to the 1st member & 2nd member

Initd U.S. 4/8/31

Initd M.V.K. 7/8/31

Please put back up the budget of the

Serial No

Municipality

Rec'd K-M. 6/8/31

Rec'd R-R 6/8/31

38) Latest balance sheet of the Tiruchirapalli Municipality has also been called for in the S.G. Branch vide D.O. Thiru agent, dt 20/8 Rec'd 24/8/31

Submitted for perusal of the Financial Secretary

H. Lacey 24.8.31

24/8

2607 24/8

Fwd A 25/8/31

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20 4-29

[illegible] No.I 3.293/27-28 dated 22nd April 1932 from the Deputy [illegible], Tanjore District to the Hon'ble Chief Secretary to Government

---

With reference to your No.I 5573/31. dated the 15th February 1932 calling for a report regarding the dispute between the Dharmakarsis of the Sri Parthasarathy temple and the Municipal Councillors of Thiruvalli, I have the honor to state that I convened a joint meeting of the Dharmakarsis of the above temple and the councillors of the Thiruvalli Municipality on the 13th instant to discuss the terms on which an amicable settlement could be arrived, re: the price to be paid for the Inam land on which a major portion of the town of Thiruvalli now stands. I enclose a copy of the decisions arrived at the said meeting for your information.

Mr. B.T. Kesaviengar, when he was the Deputy Commissioner, Tanjore, had recommended to the Huzur Commissioner in his No. Gen.1 c.293/27-28 dated the 5th April 1929 that the Municipality should pay Rs.16000/- as a fair compensation to acquire complete right and title to the Inam portion of the town. I enclose a copy of his recommendation for ready reference But the Huzur Commissioner in his report to Government dated the 6th June 1929 recommended the payment of a compensation of Rs.24000/- and when the Municipality was asked whether they would agree to pay this amount, they started raising all kinds of objections and wanted to know what the exact area of the Inam land was on which the town has been built and the nature of the Inam grant etc. I had, the survey records and the Inam Title deed thoroughly scrutinized by the Survey Officer, Tanjore and convinced the Municipal Councillors that the extent belonging to the Paduvanahalli Inam village now included in the Town is 74 acres and 3 guntas. The Municipal Councillors present have at this meeting accepted this as the correct extent and are agreeable to pay compensation for its acquisition.

After discussing with them the desirability of continuing the Municipality, as some of the Municipal Councillors were in favour of converting the area into a village Panchayet, it was finally decided that the Municipality should continue and that the Inam lands should be purchased by the Municipality.

As the Municipality has only about Rs.5000/- in reserve the Municipal Councillors present were in favour of applying for a loan at a very favourable rate of interest from Government to be repaid in annual [illegible] with interest. I have sent to the Municipality [illegible]

21

...inal consideration of the Municipality and the ... Nattamsthirum, and on getting their definite ... for and to Government by recommendations.

The only contentious point is the amount of compensation to the temple. The Dharmadarsis, taking their income into consideration demand a sum of Rs.16,000/- while the Municipal councillors, on the other hand, think that no more than Rs.10,000/- could be paid owing to the slender resources. But as the maximum and the minimum has been fixed, I think, it would be possible to fix a reasonable sum between these 2 limits now. I shall address a further communication, on receipt of the decision of the Municipality on this trial.

GENL & REV SECRETARIAT 1341 13 MAY 1932 MUZRAI

8/30-31 one 12-5-32

No. o.

Copy of the above together with a copy of the proceedings of the joint meeting of the Temple Dharmadarsis and the Municipal Councillors of Tiruchendur, is forwarded with compliments to the Financial Secretary to Government, for information in continuation of this office memo dated 12th March 1932.

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Mr. JS

39) The receipt of further [illegible] requested

Fin Secy)

14/5/32

Mr 16/5

1/615

Fin 18/5

---

5 The Municipal Councillors,

that Rs.10,000/- can be paid owing to the flooding

condition.

(Sd.) M. G.

President.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

596

2995

24

Serial No

Letter no C 40-d/30-31 & 24/1/32 from the Collector Commissioner stating that the Inthahalli Municipal Council have resolved to buy up the rights of Sir Rameshwara Rao and Lakshmi Devi in the Inam portions referred to therein for Rs 15,000/- that the Dharmadarsis pleaders are agreeable to this and requesting sanction to the proposals specified therein.

40) The proposals of the M.C. are approved.

41) The proposals of the M.C. contained in paras 2 & 3 of the Govt may be approved to the extent explained. The L.S.G. Dept may be informed.

5/12/32

42) Yes.

5-1-32.

L.S.G. with compts

5.1.33

43) The budget estimate of the Tirthahalli Taluk for 1932-3 is before us. It is seen from it that the normal expenditure of the taluk exceeds the normal income by about Rs 2000/- and there is a minus closing balance of Rs 1874/- The taluk has however invested a sum of Rs 5000 in Govt Securities and Rs 1760 in Govt S. B accounts. The taluk may

GEN. & REV. SECTT
2995
L. S. G. BRANCH.

NOTE—Con n Sheet

23

25

Mrs Kalanga revenue – Tiruchirapalli 1925

File No | of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

found it deficient to make an annual payment of £B 1000 towards the loan of £B 15000, unless it improves its finances.

for Chief 17/1 44) Please note on the contention of Mr Kesavangar adverted to by the DC. holding that the Govt order of 1928 does not apply to Tiruchirapalli and that the claim of the Mlly & the Emperor coll[r] (Mrs Kalanga) should be rejected; also what the amount of the claim (counter) of the Mlly is if available in the file. from whom does the King Comm[r] propose to recover the amount due to the temple since 1926

MSK
22/1/33.

45) The contention of the Mrs Kesaviengar (Collr &c, Shiyali &c) holding that the Govt order of 1928 does not apply to Tiruchirapalli ~~is~~ appears to be ~~correct~~ reasonable, inasmuch as the order has no application to urban areas, but only to rural areas. He considers that the temple is entitled to recover its proper dues from the plaintiffs, even after the issue of the G.O of 1928. It is the opinion of the Hon King Comm[r] that the entire claim of the temple to the entire Mrs Kalanga collection should be rejected as his proposal does not seem to be reasonable. The most claim of the temple to 25% of the collections during the period will have to be recognised under the original arrangement.

Flag Z

27/1 46) Please work up the cases leading to the 1928 Order and take as instructed with reference to the opinion of the Hon Mr

MSK
31/1/33

Serial No

Flag N

47) Ref file 426-26 (pp 160-163) & Institute for kind reference

48) The Ref cl have at this meeting held on 30-9-32, resolved that the income portion of the lease should be brought up, by payment of a sum of Rs 15000 to the temple, the ~~payment~~ claim to the Mohalanya collections ~~being~~ from 1928 also being covered by the payment, and that interest at 6% may be paid on the amount of Rs 15000, referred to, the same being treated as a loan by the temple

49) In connection with this, the then Institute noted on 3-10-1926 that the remedy seems to lay up the Mohalanya rights of the temple for the Iruvars, Gurukkals & Amps entitled (Vide para 2 of the note) Agent is also invited to Devaswom minute dt 5-6-28, wherein it was decided that the portion may be examined and that the apportionment of the Mohalanya Revenue should be revised suitably

50) Now Agent is invited to this Branch note flagged A The levy of the Mohalanya at Pitchalli being governed by proceedings of 3-5-1854, the right of the temple to the same allowed to it therein does not appear to have been cancelled by the G.O of 27-2-1928, abolishing Mohalanya in rural areas since the existing arrangement has placed the Iruvars in a disadvantageous position & it has also no modified as to meet the

Z

NOTE—Contn Sheet

27 Mohalanga revenue - Lutchalli Eng.

File No of 193

having needs the rate payers in regard to sanitation and works of town improvement.

51) Cb Called for rules

Rec'd Mysp

52 The question under consideration in the file and the points for decision are explained in the note at pages 16 to 18 of these notes * Flag H

53 The proposals now submitted by the Dy Com'r, Shimoga, in consultation with the Municipal Council, Shikarpur, and the Dharmadarsi of the Rameswara temple, and agreed to by the Mysore Com'r are as follows.—

(i) That the Municipality should pay Rs 15,000 to the temple and that the temple should give up all its rights over the main portion of the town

(ii) That the amount should be treated as a loan by the temple to the Municipality carrying interest at 6% per annum and repayable in instalments of not less than Rs 1000 at a time, the entire amount being repayable within 30 years

(iii) That the loan should be the first charge on the Municipal revenues

54 These proposals no doubt seem to be alright and acceptable as securing a satisfactory solution of a long pending question, but there are a few points in regard to which there is some doubt and explanation

Serial No

A

It is stated in the Dy Com's letter of 31.10.32 that the Municipal Council have agreed to the terms referred to But the latest resolution of the Council on the subject of 30.9.32 while agreeing to pay Rs 15.000 at 6% interest does not mention anything about the instalment of Rs 1000 at a time, the interval at which the instalment are to be paid & the total period of repayment viz 30 years. It is for consideration if the Municipal Council can be taken to have agreed to these details as well as to the proposal to treat the amount due as a first charge on their revenues, to be adjusted by the Comptroller, under the orders of Govt in cases of default in regular payment No later resolution of the MCC accepting these terms is forthcoming among the papers sent

7 Another point on which no agreement between the MCC & the Dharmadarsis has been reached is about the Mohatarfa collections from 1928 upto the time of the settlement proposed The Hon'ble Council thinks that under G.O no L4973-5005-L B 26-26-163 dt 22.2 1928 abolishing the levy of mohatarfa in all villages in the State the Temple has no right to the collections, but this view is not accepted by the Dharmadarsis who, however, have in their resolution dt 2 10 1932 left the point for decision by Govt The Dy Com (Mr B T Krishna Iyengar) concurred — and the present Dy Com ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ agrees with him, that the said G O not being applicable to urban areas the arrangement ordered in G O no 18646-7 dt 35/18 L 7161-92

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 70—GBPM—60 000—13 8 31

cannot be considered to have been superseded by the G.O of 1928 and that therefore the claim of the temple to their share of the mohatarfa for the period referred to cannot be denied the Inwar can agree with the view of the Dy. Com and say that the claim of the Mcc to the whole amount should be rejected [redacted] the point is for orders

6) The capacity of the Mun Council to pay the interest on the loan and the instalment of Rs 1000 has also to be considered though according to the current year's budget estimates the Municipality has a menis closing balance of Rs 1874, its investments amount to Rs 6761-8-1 & it has no liabeleties With the reserve and the additional income to be derived from the increased portion of Motars under the new arrangement be able to meet their obligation in respect of the loan

7) for orders

Ans 1/3

(Sd/ Keer)

8) Please speak to me on Monday with a draft of the R.C. pointing out A on the last page and asking in his opinion or B on the back.

9) What is the principal of accepting the Mcc view in respect of Cochatarfa

RLB 19/1/33

10) Issue Circular as per

Sd 21/1/33

11) After issue Note may be sent to the Inwardsfor information.

Ans 24/1

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
13 MAR 1933
No.

1 Sep
Pres
1-3
2nd S.

PRINTING
21 MAR
REVS

Mechanical revenue — Sirsi taluka — 1933

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No 31 | 15) 4- L of 1930 | [App F III—2

Serial No

To the D.C. Shimoga
6229 dt 25-3-33
Calls for certain particulars in the matter.

(64) The file is sent to Mysore for information — Refer para 62 supra.
(Asst. Mysore Branch with enclosures)

CG 5/4

GENL. & REV. SECT. SECRETARIAT 1054 6 APR. 1933 BANGALORE.

65) Subd. for perusal
Sd 6/4/33

(66) For Secy)
Sd 7/4/33

(18 MR)

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MYSORE (C) INFTY. 10 APR 1933 No 6639-

(67) Sd 8/4

Mysore (1/4/33)
Sd 12/4

(68) L.S.G. the enclosures

Sd 12/4

60 From the D.C. Shimoga Dt-
no MISC 293/27-8 Dt 12/7/33
Furnishes the info called for
& the D.C. says that the mel have resolved on 28.5.33 that the sum of Rs 15,000/- should be paid within a period of 30 years in instalments of not less than Rs 1000/- at a time & that this amount may be a first charge on the mel revenues

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

2995
311 311

Dispute between Dharmakadi mc

MC File No 31 of 1930

General Secretariat

2nd

that they have further resolved on 30.6.33 that their financial position will be improved as a result of the settlement of this dispute and they would pay the instalment of Rs 1000/- once in 2 years and the interest at the end of May every year. The Dharmadarsis are also reported to have resolved agreeing to this resolu of the one el

To Subd with refce to paras 56 to 62 Supra,

MB 17/7 71 The proposals so far as they concern the Municipality appear to be acceptable. If his views approved, file may be returned to the Mysuru Branch for further action with reference to para 41 Supra

(Sen Secy) 18/7

19 7 33

72) The annual income of the Municipality and its annual expenditure including items of Expenditure on Essential Services such as Conservancy and Lighting of the Town may be ascertained from for the five years ending 1931-32.

73) From the review of the GR Committee dated 15 May 1932 it is seen that

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 193

Serial No

the normal expenditure of the Municipality for the year 1932-33 was Rs 75-98 as against an normal income of Rs 56/3.

74) The existing rates of the municipality was 6761 Rs.

75) It is recommended here the present recommendation of the Municipality to grant an annual interest of 900 Rs at 6 per cent Rs 15000, and after 1000 Rs for Rs towards principal of Municipality would be possible.

150×6 = 900

76) The Dr may be asked to visit the matter in fuller detail and submit a clear report.

77) The municipal resolution dated 30-6-33 is very valuable - It has not conveniently furnished with facts and figures.

78) The exact financial position.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 70—GBPM—60 000—13-8 31

Application of 31 mohatarfa

File No of 193 | General and R Secretaris

for the Municipality and must be first decided as its present financial position can by no means stand the load.

Sd
20.7.33

(9) In the Municipal Council's letter dated 26th May 1932 it is stated that the Temple shall give up all its rights over the Arama portion of the Park. Does this mean surrender of interest in Candasa? The position requires to be cleared. ~~The Municipality should explain the~~

20-7-33

(10) District Collector's view in the matter before action may be taken

Sd 2 drafts submd,
MB 21/7

2nd For perusal before issue
(Asst Secy)
dms 27/7

28/7

831 Issue for 29/7

GENERAL SECN
28 JULY 1933

TYPING SECTION
29 JUL 1933
GENL & REV SECTT

Appropriation of mohataipa in Shirthahalli

General and Revenue Secretariat — [App F III—2

ME File No 31 of 1933.

258

Serial No	
61	D C, Shimoga no d 949 D 31 Z 33 Calls for a further detailed report memo no d 950 D 31 Z 33. Copy to ME
62	To the Muzrai Commr R 951 D 31 Z 33 Enquires whether the statt that the Rameswaraswami temple should give up all its rights over the inam portion of the town means surrendering of interest in the lands also
	Qus A 1/8
63	Letr no muz e 293 dy 18-12-33 from the DC, Shimoga stg forwarding a copy of the note of the Asst Commr, Shimoga on the financial position of the mutt and also a copy of the statement showing its annual income and expenditure for the past 5 years.
S	a) The Asst Commr's note explains the financial position of the mutt and suggests methods for the repayment of the loan of Rs 15000 to be taken by the mutt. b) The Dep. Cmr thinks that the temple while giving up all its rights over the inam portions, should surrender all its interest also in the inam portion

NOTE—Contn Sheet

3117 397 / 1999 of 1930

General Secretariat

Ref File No

6) The receipt from [illegible] called for
further [illegible] Murray ... cover in 81-6-2 supra
with the enquiry, if appd.

7) Please put up a DO reminder
to the Murrai case

Reminder issued No L 5042 dated 8-1-34

Letter no 108/30-31-07-11-1-34 bis
the Murgeon in reply stating that
he agrees with the view we, since
that the temple, while giving up all its
rights over the main portion should surrender
all its interests also in the 9 main portions.

8) During connection the Murgeon also
suggested that the first alternative
proposal suggested by the S. D. O. re the mode
of payment of the amount agreed upon by the
Murgeon viz the immediate payment of a sum of
Rs 5000 in the shape of 6¼% loan bonds,
the balance of Rs 10000 being spread over a
period of 10 years under the satisfactory
arrangement.

2796 — 3368 —

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mdl File No 31 of 1930 | [App. F III—2

Serial No

89) Send with reference to paras 12-79 of the notes supra.

90 For orders

13/1 MV

(Sec'tary)

16/1

91 I agree with the Nazrat Comm^r

17 JAN 1934 No 484

Nazrat Dr 16/1

[illegible] (Nazrat)

With compts

31.1.34

92) The M.C. had detailed proposals in his letter no 400 of 24.11.32 which read with the P.C. would make the position clear. In lieu of the rights held by Sri Rameswara Devaru over the inam portion of Thalaie, the temple have to remit annually Rs 1500/- the balance of the M.C. this behalf, is acceptable if the balance of Rs 10,000/- is paid in equal instalments with reasonable interest which the temple would derive if the entire sum were made to pay in a lump sum —

93) The present proposal is to accept a sum of Rs 15,000/ from the Mdl. Council of Mimanhalli for the benefit of Sri Ramadevaru temple at the place, in lieu of the Temple giving up its rights

GENL & REV SECRETARIAT 866 5 FEB 1934 MADRAS BRANCH

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0434—GPB—15 000—12 10-3°

1596 Re: Tirthakalli Rameswara devasthanam temple
Inam land rights

2nd File No 31 of 193 2

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No

over the inam within the town & the surrender of the interest in the lands abovementioned in respect of the payment of the amount the AC recommends that the proposal that the alternative proposal of the SDO Shimoga under which a sum of Rs 5000/- in the shape of 6½% loan bonds can be paid immediately & the balance of Rs. 10000/- can be spread over 10 years with carrying interest at 6% pa, is a satisfactory arrangement & may be favourably considered.

H

95) According to the report of the SDO about the Financial position of the Municipality it is seen that a sum of Rs. 1000/- pa will be available towards the payment of the instalment of the loan. But no mention is made as to how the interest on the loan which comes to Rs. 600/- pa @ 6% is proposed to be met perhaps it could be met might be possible if the arrears to the extent of Rs 4569/- are collected & if the charges are increased by the revision of taxes on buildings & lands. Vide penultimate para of the SDO's report.

B

(91) Vide para this amount is the annual instalment for both principal & interest

B

Recd 7/2/34

96) The proposal of the M.C. contained in the Resolution (letter dt 10/11.1.34) as abstracted at A. above may be accepted

B

OFFICE OF THE ... LOUR, CIL...
1 FEB 1934
5-1446

N 8/2/34

H. Secy)

2nd Mr)

98) N 13.2.34 L 14/2/34

Serial No

99 The asst Secy may put up a brief connected note giving the history of the case & the points for orders now, early.

Spl
17/2
2
1/9/12

100 According to fo. no 18646/L7 161-92 dy 3.5.94 Sri Rameswaraswami temple at Tirthahalli was enjoying ¾ of the Inhatanfa collected in the Inam portion of the Municipality and the other ¼ was being credited to the Municipality.

Flag Y

(2) The Municipality was contending that the whole of the Inhatanfa should go to it and the 1st Member minuted on 3.10.26 as follows:— "The remedy seems to be to buy up the Inhatanfa rights of the temple for the Municipality Govt & Mly contributing" On 5.6.28 the Dewan minuted as follows:— "It is a long pending question — 75% of the Inhatanfa is now credited to the temple funds & only 25% to the Municipality — It is, if anything, like the reverse of the" and ~~the~~ argument if any steps had been taken to separate the Municipal & temple funds.

Page 2 para 2 of notes Flag A

Page 5 of notes Flag B

~~(3) Rajaratnam for the Municipality~~ The Mc having

10/A

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0434—GPB—15 000—12-10-29

been requested to report what income the temple derived from Mohatsavs and in case this income ceased how the loss to the temple shd be made good, he sent to the Spot more than once and after a good deal of correspondence reported on 24.11.32 that the Trustees of Mt Council had resolved to buy up the rights of Sri Rameswaraswami temple over the drain portion of the Municipality for Rs 15000/- and that the Dharmadayam of the temple also were agreeable to it (Flag H)

3. After further correspondence about the ways & means of effecting this arrangement the final proposal submitted by the Mt C. on 11.1.34 is that the Compensation of Rs 15000/- ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ refd to above may be received as follows:—

(1) To accept an immediate payment of Rs 6000/- in the ~~xxx~~ shape of 6½% State Loan Bonds and

(2) To recover the balance of Rs 10000/- in ten years with interest at 6% per annum

The points for orders now are:—

(1) To accept Rs 15000/- as Compensation to be paid to the temple for ~~xxx~~ the drain rights acquired by the Municipality

(2) The temple, in consideration of the above Compensation, to surrender

Sri Ramaswamidevaru temple Hunsur in Nanjanagud Taluk
Mohatarfa Revenue & Miscellaneous
816

Revenue Secretariat | File No 31 of 1930 | [App F III—2

Serial No

to main rights over the Municipality as also all the interests therein

(3) To accept recovery of the Compensation Amount of Rs 15000/- as follows:-

(a) Rs 5000/- immediately to be paid in the shape of 6½% State Loan Bonds.

(b) Rs 10000/- to be paid in ten annual instalments with interest at 6%, the equated payments amounting to Rs 1358-12-0 per year.

being treated as a loan due by the M.C. to the Temple

(4) As the present financial position of the Municipality admits of only Rs 1000/- being set apart for repaying this sum of Rs 10000/- due to the temple, Whether the M.C. should not be instructed to increase the income by Rs 360/- by enhancement the taxes or levying octroi duty as it may deem fit, to enable it to make regular payment of instalments to the Temple. Submitted for orders

B

ultimate ref Fig B

2/3/34

II Member) 105 The amount of Rs 15000 agreed upon as suitable compensation may be accepted, the Temple giving up all its rights. As regards payment, the proposals of the Municipal Council may be accepted. The D.C. should be instructed to see that the M.C. makes due provision for this in their annual budget.

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL
5 MAR 1934
No 565-3

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0431—GPB—15 000—12-10-33

Financial Secy 106 8/3 9/3

39)

3348 E(a)

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No [illegible] 37 of 1930

Serial No

10) The file will, if approved be sent to the Leg. Branch for issuing orders as per Member's Minute in para 10 supra.

10/3/34

Yes
12/3/34

L.S.G. with Compliments
108

12/3

Typed Draft submitted
12/3/34 110 Please get the Draft G.O typed as revised

5/4

Typing Section
5/4

TYPING SECTION
3 APR 1934
GENL & REV SECTT

Typed Draft submitted
6/4 111

112 The Draft may be approved

113 On page 3 of the note of the S.D.O, Shimoga, it is suggested that the period of 30 years agreed upon by the temple for repayment of the loan should remain in force, whatever any financial difficulty which the Mgt may get into. It is for consideration if this should be mentioned in the order in view of the terms decided upon viz to pay Rs 5000 as the 1st instalment & the balance in ten annual instalments of Rs 1000, besides interest

114 It is not clear if a formal agreement between the temple & the Mgt embodying the terms is necessary or whether the G.O is enough for all purposes.

11/- Regarding the point mentioned

Serial No

T

In para 3 of the Municipal Comr's letter D/24 11-32 as to whether the title of the temple to get a fourth of the Mohatarfa collection from 1928, no orders have been passed, and no reference is made to it in the Draft G.O. Perhaps the matter may be considered later, if and when a further communication is received

Dept Secy) 116 Asst 7/4

Financial Secy of mtg concurred

114 Asst 11/4

Je2920/11-4-34

GENL & REV SECRETARIAT 1124 13 APR 1934 MADRAS

117 1. In para 3 of the draft G.O. it seems desirable to add the following as per the letter D/24 11.32 (Flag T):—

"In case the Municipality defaults in making payments of instalments legally due to the temple, the Comptroller is authorised to make the necessary adjustment out of the revenues of the Municipality"

2. It seems desirable that there should be a formal agreement between the temple & the Municipality.

3. Separate action will have to be taken to calculate the Mohatarfa Amount due to the temple for 1928 & to the order of Mrs & Arrange for its payment.

28/4/34

DEVEL 24 JUL 1934 468

Je Secy) 116 I agree

Dev Secy) 24/7

WD 70—GBPM—60 000—13-8-31 Note on page 12

117 25/7

NOTE—Contn Sheet

650 p 694

41)

File No 5348 of 193

General and Rev[illegible] Secretariat

120 Re 1, it does not seem quite necessary to make the addition proposed as ~~it is~~ the Dy Com'r that sanctions the annual estimates of the Municipality and as he can therefore see that the necessary provision on account of the loan instalment and interest is included in the Budget and payment made to the temple on the due date

Re 2, the Law Section ... consulted

Dep Secy) 28/7

121 [illegible] 30/7

Asst Secy Law Secy wrt Comptr) 31/7

122 The temple is a juristic person distinct from Govt, though it may be under Govt management. It is therefore necessary that the transaction between the temple and the Municipality be put in a written document so as to be effective under the M' Repn. If required a draft may be prepared by the Govt advocate.

Law Reporter to Return 31/7

Asst Secy Govt Comptr 31/7

Dep Secy) 1/8

123 The draft may be issued accordingly

[illegible] 1/8



Buying up the rights of Rameswaram temple
351, E
by the Mut thahalli mahal
42

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No 87 of 1926-27. — [App F III

Serial No

124 Remtd with an addition after para 3 of the draft G.O, requesting the Nuzvid Court to arrange for the execution of the agreement.

Dewan Secy)
Second Member

28/8
MW 28/8 AGR 2088

OFFICE 25 AUG 1934 No 991

OFFICE OF THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL 26 AUG 1934 No —

125 The draft may be appd
My order on was passed on 8-3-34
It has taken more than 5 months
to have the draft appd & issued.
This shd be avoided

AGR 23/8
MW 23/8 AGR 2588

126 For perusal of the draft order before issue
Dewan

MW 25/8/34 AGR 2578

127 No unusual relay points and S & II Branch
in disposal of this matter reflects no credit on
the concerned staff. They
shd open no occasion 2578
for such complaint again

TYPING SECTION 28 AUG 1934 GENL & REV. SECTT

128 May be issued and the file submitted
WD 01955—1,5B—1,10,2 12-6 I seen also for perusal

MW 28/8
1.9.34 Issued & returned AGR 2878

NOTE—Contn Sheet

Buying up the rights [redacted]

63

3348/1

File No 31 3348/8 of 1930 87 General and Revenue Secretariat

To

The Murasu Court in Regnl
u Deputy-Comr, Shimoga Distt
u Comptroller to Govt
u Director of Land Records, Survey & Settlement
no L 1462-6-Dy 28/8/34

Passes orders on the proposals of the Thirthahalli municipal Council to buy up the rights of Sri Rameswara Temple over the transportation of the municipality for Rs 15,000/- & the manner of payment of this sum to the Temple

13-6 Submitted with reference to paras 128 & 129 of the rules supra.

for perusal

Fin'l Secy

30/8/34 AV

Ans 30/8

PT-6

3348
2

(44)

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 193 | [App F III—

Serial No



I am sorry for having kept this file from 28th April 1934 to 24th July 1934 and delayed its disposal. This is due to the following reasons.-

I was very busy in connection with the framing of the Budget Estimates for 1934-35 and measures to be taken to minimise expenditure and restore Budget equilibrium, till about the 17th May 1934 (date of Budget Council Meeting).

I wanted to discuss with Mr Muddukrishnappa on certain points raised by him in the file and could not do so till 4th July 1934 as he was on leave from 18th May 1934 to 11th June 1934, I was in Mysore thereafter in connection with the Budget Session of the R.A and I was subsequently engaged in connection with the L.C till 4th July 1934.

After a discussion with Mr. Muddukrishnappa in the early part of July, I wanted to get some more information about the capacity of the Municipality to repay the loan .

Due to the Budget season, there was some accumulation of arrears which I had to clear in the month of July 1934

D E W A N).

4/9/34

579

6.9.34.

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0 955—GPB—22 500—12-6 34

US)

3348

File No

of 193

Treasury and Revenue Secretariat

753

For perusal

Secretary)

SECOND MAIL 1500 7 SEP 1934

7 SEPT 1934 No. 15616

This file was wanted by the Revenue Branch to which it will be sent, if approved.

Yes

13/9/34

Rev. Br. M C

13/9

The file was returned by the Revenue Branch today.

10/9/34.

2nd PSIV

13/9

J

B

10 x 34

APPENDIX G]

SUBJECT

1)

Diary No of letter replied to 1449.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Date of issue 7-5-28

Signed by Mr F.K. Someswara Iyer

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

Section ~~Mr Army~~

File No ~~81-26~~ 444-28

Serial No

Mily No 2010 /

To The Hony Comr

Sir,

I am directed to State that orders have ~~State~~ been passed in G.O. no & 4973-5003 L.B 26-26-163 dy 27-2-1928 that the levy of Mohatarfa taxes be abolished in all the villages in the State (Gunt, viam and Jahagir). The Temple of Sri Rameswara & Tirthahalli can no longer levy Mohatarfa in the Gram posham of the Tirthahalli

over

WD 0376—3PL—81000—26 & 27

2)

Municipality and the contribution of
US, three-fourths of the municipal
MK taxes levied in the Inam portion
of the Municipality in accordance
with the G.O no. 1866-7/d 7 161-92
dt 3-5-1894 should therefore
cease. I am accordingly
to request to be informed
what income the temple hereby
derived from Inchatanga
for the last 3 years
and in case, this income
ceases, how the temple is to be the loss to
for ~~reimbursed to that extent thereafter~~ the temple is to be made good.
13 (2.) The favor of a very
early reply is requested

I have etc

Dy Dist Secy

MK
27/4/28

Mun
30/4/28

M C. 13]



OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 6th June 1929

No. 1503 Confdl 28-9

ID 1941
Jany 434-28-2

FROM

P.G.D'Souza,Esq., B.A., B.L.,
~~The~~ *Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore*

21

To

B.Srinivasa Iyengar,Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.2010/Muz. dated 7th May 1928. and subsequent communications, I have the honor to forward herewith --- copy of letter No.Muz.1c.293of 27-28 dated 5-4-29 from the Deputy ---- Commissioner, Shimoga District, submitting a report in the matter of the mohatarfa revenue enjoyed by the temple of Sri Rameswaraswami at -- Thirthahalli.

2. The Deputy Commissioner's letter is full and deals exhaustively with all aspects of the question.

I discussed the matter with the Vice-President of the Municipality and some of the Municipal members on the occasion of my visit to Thirthahalli on the 22nd instant. It was agreed that the Municipality should pay to the temple the Deputy Commissioner being also present compensation of Rs.24000/- of which Rs.5000/---- should be paid immediately and the balance with the interest at 4% by annual payment of Rs.1000/- each. The Municipality consents to reimburse itself by means of house taxes and for the lump-sum payment---- the right of the temple over the Padavanahalli part of the town will have to be transferred to the Municipal council. A resolution to the above effect has been promised and on its receipt a further report ~~w~~ in the matter will be submitted for ~~the~~ final orders of Government.

I consider this

I consider this to

while on the one hand it will ex

cipal areas it will ensure adequate

the extinction of its existing rights.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

MUZARAI COMMISSIONER.

Letter No.Muz.1.C.293/27-28 dated 5th April 1929 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

5)

MOHATARFA - TIRTHAHALLI TOWN - RIVAL CLAIMS OF THE SRI RAMESWARASWAMI TEMPLE AND THE MUNCIPALITY.

******

With reference to your Memo No. C. 1503/27-28 dated the 17th May 1928 forwarding for report a copy of letter No.2010/Muz. dated 7-5-1928 from the Financial Secretary to Government, re the abolition of Mohatarfa tax in the Inam portion of the Tirthahalli Town, I have the honor to forward herewith the connected records ending with letter No.R2-16/28-29 dated 12-12-1928 from the Sub Division Officer, Tirthahalli Sub Division.

2. Before entering into a discussion of the above subject, I would mention here a brief history of the levy of Mohatarfa in the Tirthahalli Town, which is as follows.-

The present town of Tirthahalli is made up of three separate villages viz., Padavananahalli, Kuruvalli and Tirthahalli. Padavanahalli ceased to exist long ago as a separate village The temple of Sri Rameswaraswami is the Inamdar of Padavanahalli The Inam Register shows that the temple has been in enjoyment of the Mohatarfa revenue in addition to the benefits from the inam lands of that village since at least the year 1800. It is seen from the records that the Mohatarfa which the temple collected prior to 1861-62 never exceeded its old beriz, viz., R. 46-3-8 It increased year after year with the growth of population of the town, it was Rs 1032/- in 1887-88 and R. 1604-8-0 in 1927-28 So long as Padavanahalli retained its character as a distinct village, the temple's right to levy and appropriate the entire Mohatarfa to its own purpose does not seem to have been questioned. With the growth of population in the town and trade activities growing up the need for Muncipal organisation was found necessary and a Muncipality was formed. The Muncipality in the ordinary course of things had to find a source of income for meeting the increasing demands of the town in respect of sanitation and conservancy. The Mohatarfa collections being entirely appropriated by the temple, the Muncipality levied a separate tax called 'Kachara terage' for the above purpose. The residents of the town naturally resented this double taxation and further demanded that the temple should be made to contribute its share of Mohatarfa to the Muncipality towards conservancy and improvements. Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao, C.I.E., the then Deputy Commissioner after a careful examination of all the aspects of the case and discussion with the towns-people and the Panchayatdars of the temple made a recommendation to Government

(b) supporting the abolition of the separate
and allotments of ¼ of the Mohatarfa realised in the
of the town of the Municipality, the remaining ¾ being utilised
the temple for its use. This was sanctioned by Government in their
order No.18646-7 L.F.161-92 dated 3-5-1894. This arrangement which
came into effect from 1st July 1894 is still in force although the
rate payers have now been raising controversial issues which will be
adverted to in fra

3. While things stand thus, the rate payers and the Municipal Council are not satisfied with the present system of allotment of Mohatarfa collections between the Municipality and the temple. Ever since 1920 they have been agitating that the entire realisations of Mohatarfa should be made over to them as the income from Municipal taxation should be wholly appropriated for Municipal purposes. This agitation pre-supposes that the Municipal Council are entitled to levy the Municipal taxes even in Inam areas when such areas have been included within Municipal limits. Their agitation virtually amounts to a reconsideration of the order passed in 1894 and abrogation of the same. Apart from the legal aspect, which this question involves, the equity of the case also has to be carefully examined. During the Dewan's tour in this District in January 1927 certain representations were made to him by the Municipal Councillors in the matter of fixing the boundary of the Inam portion of the town and settling questions relating to the apportionment of Moha-tarfa, and the Dewan was pleased to direct the appointment of a Committee to go into the question and submit their opinion to Government for orders. Accordingly a reference was submitted to you in this office letter No.Muz.1-3. 293/27-28 dated 27-9-27 on which orders are awaited In the meanwhile, Government have, in their order No.4973-5005 I.P.26-26-163 dated 27-2-1928 abolished the levy of Mohatarfa in all villages of the State. In the light of this Government Order, a report has been called for by the Financial Secretary in his letter dated 7-5-1928 (which is under reply) as to how the loss of revenue to the temple by abolition of Mohatarfa is to be made good.

4. It will be seen from the above that, the Government Order dated 27-2-1928 abolishing Mohatarfa as an item of revenue has given a different turn altogether to the question of the future financial relation

relationship between the temple and the Municipality. The main issue at present is not the determination of the boundaries of the Muzrai town and t the Municipal town at Tirthahalli, but, whether, by virtue of the above orde the temple has lost the right to the ¾ of the Mohatarfa collected in the Inam portion which was hitherto being credited to the temple. The Financial Secretary's communication refefred to above would seem to suggest that the temple is not now entitled to the ¾ of the revenue. On the other hand, the rate payers contend that the levy of Mohatarfa having been aboli ched, they are not bound to pay any taxes to the Municipality so far as the Inam portion is concerned It appears to me that the Government Order abolishing the levy of Mohatarfa can have no application in Municipal arreas where local taxation is governed by the Municipal Regulation and the rules thereunder or by Special Executive orders of Government issued in regard to the levy of taxes in such areas. The town of Tirthahalli, being an urban area, was constituted into a Municipality by Government, in their N Notification No.36/Ml.86-17-96 dated 1-7-1913, and the Inam portion known as Padavananalli was included within the boundaries of the Municipality No exception was taken to the inclusion of the Inam portion in the Municipality then, obviously on the presumption that the order of 1894 would continue to be in force The temple and the Municipality have thus continued to enjoy their alloted shares in the Mohatarfa revenue of the Muzrai Town, since then. Padavanahalli cannot now be separated from Tirthahalli town as it is likely to happen that portions of some houses may lie in both areas. The financial relationship between the temple and the Municipality, it appears to me, would seem to have been based on the contract sanctioned by Government regarding the enjoyment of the Mohatarfa revenue by the institutions concerned in the proportion fixed and has nothing to do with the recent orders of Government abolishing Mohatarfa in rural areas. Although the tax levied in the Municipality is for convenience designated 'MOHATARFA' it really is a Municipal tax and may not be confused with the Mohatarfa that was being levied in rural areas The order of 1894 clearly recognises this aspect of the case

5. While this should be recognised as the position as regards the levy of the tax itself, the question of the propriety of apportionment of revenue between the temple and the Municipality will next have to be considered Strictly speaking, it is no doubt correct to urge that taxes levied in a Municipal area should go to meet the charges on account of

6) sanitation, medical relief, and other obligatory [redacted] body under the statute. Apart from this, even the right [redacted] Mohatarfa in Inam villages, conceded to the Inamdars was subject [redacted] the obligation that the realisations would be spent in the interests of the villagers concerned In fact in the order of 1894, the Government have left this question open observing as follows.- "the levy of a separate house-tax for Municipal purpose in addition to the Mohatarfa levied by the Inamdar cannot but prove ~~but~~ needlessly oppressive. If the Inamdar is entitled to collect a house tax as distinct from a mere ground rent it will be but fair to make him bear the expenses of Municipal conservancy." From this point of view the contention of the Municipal Council, that whole of the Mohatarfa revenue should go to them is not plausible but has much force in it.

6. The fact that the existing state of things has been allowed to continue all these years would seem to suggest that Government are inclined to uphold the rights of the temple as much as the rights of the Municipality If this view is correct the position taken up by the Municipality cannot be fully supported. The temple should be deemed to have surrendered its right of taxation to the Municipality in consideration of being duly compensated for the losses. The income from Mohatarfa is the main-stay of the temple and to deprive the institution completely of its ancient right without compensating for its loss would be against public policy and the interests of a popular religious institution. Thus, the position now is that on the one hand the temple claims its share of Mohatarfa on the strength of the Inam Sannad and the order of 1894, while on the other the Municipality enforces the rights of the tax payers in regard to the tax levied in the Inam portion of the town.

7. I have given much thought to this vexed question and I consider the adoption of the following alternative courses would be only means of solving a somewhat complicated and delicate matter One course of action is to take advantage of the proviso contained in the second portion of the Government Order of 1894 reserving for consideration the the portion of a revision of the existing order of things, and to arrive at a more satisfactory proportion of distribution of revenue between the Municipality and the temple, a proportion which will not deplete the temple revenues completely, but which will augment the Municipal revenues considerably The income from Mohatarfa has not increased to any appreciable extent since 1894 It may be possible

9)

to reduce the expenditure in the temple to an extent which will make a re-distribution of revenue at 50 per cent to each of the institutions. This arrangement would not however, be a satisfactory one as the same troubles would crop up in future and there would be no incentive to the Municipality to improve the resources in the Inam portion of the town by periodical revision of taxation &c.

8. The other alternative will be to allow the Municipality to buy over all the rights and interests the temple has in the Inam portion of the town and to leave it free to impose taxes in accordance with the Municipal Regulation and Rules thereunder. The question for consideration would then be at what price this right may be acquired. Taking the 50 per cent basis as suggested in the first alternative we may fix Rs.16000/- as a fair price for acquiring complete control over the Inam portion of the town. This amount may be advanced as a loan to the Municipality out of State Funds or the General Muzrai Funds the Municipality being allowed to repay the loan in 25 instalments Although this arrangement would not benefit the Municipality immediately, it will make to evince interest in the revision of taxes, &c., so far as to meet their liability and if necessary to levy ground rent also in regard the lands the right over which have been thus acquired.

9. If the above suggestions commend themselves to you, I shall call for the resolution of the Municipality on the proposals If that body accepts either of the two proposals the Government may then kindly be moved in the matter and sanction obtained thereto. In the event of the Municipality not agreeing to the terms thus offered, an impasse would appear to be the inevitable result, to avoid which the Inam area has to be ceded to the temple, thus separating it from the Sirthahalli Town proper. There would then be two distinct Municipalities each to be administered independently of the other. If the Inam area does not satisfy the conditions necessary to constitute it into a Municipality it will have to revert to its original status the Inam village of Padavanahahalli In the latter contingency the temple automatically loses its title to levy Mohatarfa by virtue of the order of 28-2-1923, as rural areas come under the purview of the Village Panchayat Regulation. In any view of the case the interests of temple stand on slippery ground in regard to utilisation of the taxes it levies in the Inam area and it will be compelled to meet the wishes of the tax payers To make up for the loss in the direction, the Inamdar will have to have recourse to levy ground rent, thus subjecting the residents in the Inam portion to

two taxes. All the above consequences are most undesirable and lead to further complications. It is to be hoped, however, that the Municipality will not allow the matter to take that turn, but view the question in the light in which Government have viewed it and give its support to either of the alternative proposals made above.

10 Summing up the result of the foregoing discussion, I find the matter standing as follows -

(1) The levy of the Mohatarfa at Tirthahalli being governed by the order of 3-5-1894, the right of the temple to the share alloted to it therein does not appear to have been cancelled by the Government Order of 28-2-1928 abolishing Mohatarfa in rural areas

(2) The right of the temple has, however its corresponding obligation and since the existing arrangement has placed the Municipality in a disadvantageous position it has to be so modified as to meet the growing needs of the rate payers in regard to sanitation and works of town improvement.

(3) To arrive at an equitable arrangement as between the temple and the Municipality there appear but two courses left open to adoption, provided the latter Body is willing to abide by them - The first is for the Municipality to acquire all ~~xxx~~ rights the temple possesses in the Inam area, by paying a lumpsum price of Rs.16000/- as proposed in para 8 supra. The other remedy lies in enhancing the ratio of the share of the Municipality from ¼ to ½ at least of the Mohatarfa realised in the Inam portion.

11. As regards the settlement of the boundary line between the Inam and Municipal portion of the town, the question is evidently a technical one to be determined with reference to the Survey and Inam Settlements records The District Surveyor, who was deputed to this work has demarcated the boundary in accordance therewith and the Amildar is satisfied that the demarcation corresponds with what is in vogue in the locality. If the Municipality is not satisfied with the demarcation made by the District Surveyor, it may be got scrutinised by a responsible gazetted officer of the Survey Department. In any event, the appointment at this juncture of a special committee to investigate the boundary question would not, in my view, serve any useful purpose.

12 There remains one point on which urgent orders of Government are

11)

called for On the strength of the Government Order of 28-2-1928 abolish ing Mohatarfa, several residents of the Tirthahalli town, have withheld payment of the Mohatarfa tax in the Inam portion. One of the residents has issued a Lawyer's notice to the Municipal President stating that the recovery of Mohatarfa in the Inam porton is illegal in view of the above Government Order and that a suit would be filed against the Municipality if its payment is enforced. In the view, I have taken of the matter, the contention of the defaulters appears to be untenable. Even granting that the temple has lost its right to collect Mohatarfa by reason of the aforesaid Government Order, the Municipality can still levy taxes under the Municipal Regulation as it has been regularly constituted into a Municipality in 1918 I therefore, request that with a view to remove any possible doubt in this matter and to enable the Municipality to smoothly carry on the administration, Government may kindly be moved to declare that the right of the Municipality to levy taxes in its area is not affected by the Government Order No.5026-L.P. 26-26-164 dated 28-2-1928 and that pending settlement of the question at issue, viz ,,the future relationship of the temple and the Municipality, the arrangement ordered in May 1894 be maintained in status quo.

"Copy"

For Muzrai Commissioner

M C 13]

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 27th 28 June 192[illegible]

No 1503 / 27-8

28 JUNE 1929 No- 47

FROM

P. C. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
~~The~~ *Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore*

Muzrai 444-28-2.

To

P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L., 19.1984
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department,

27.6.29 SIR,

I have the honor to request that the file of vernacular --- papers re mohatarfa revenue of the Inam portion of the Thirthahalli -- town sent with this office letter of the 19th instant, may kindly be returned, as they are required by the Municipal Council for its ------ reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

The main file was submitted
final. Secty for orders
c.27 6 29 - 915 returned
may be awaited
submit
AY 4/7/29.

Appendix F G - 1

SUBJECT

13

Section Jung

File No 444 - 28

Serial No 4

No 115

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

Diary No *of letter replied to*

Date of issue 16 . 7 / 1929

Signed by Jm Y. K. S. Dyer

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no 1503 - Dy 28th June 1929 Re the Inchatanja Revenue of the main portion of the Tirthahalli town, I am directed to return herewith the Revenue records connected with the case, and to request that the submission of the further report promised in the matter may be expedited.

I have &c.

over

for Secy to Govt

st of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT

14)

Immediate

Section

File No

Serial No

No 657

Diary No of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 18 9 30

Signed by for V. S Sastri

To

Dear Mr Ramasubbaiengar

I write to invite reference to your office memo no. 1583-27-8 dated 9-6 regarding the Mahatma revenue of the Import duties of Ferrakali town, and subsequent reminders from this office on the subject; and to request you to let me have information on the following points:

1). Was the committee to go into the question admitted as treated after

over

Submitted for approval

18/9/30.

Issue

VS

18.9.30

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 02347—GPB—5,000—1-4-30

[redacted]

Dewan and Revenue Member

a report on the question (p[redacted]

See No 2005 I.C. 293/27-28

dated 27-9-27 from the D.C.

Shencottah to the Hony. Commr.

referred to in the D.C.'s letter

dated 5-4-1929 to you.

2) Have the Municipal members formally agreed to pay compensation to the temple in lieu of the extinction of its rights as proposed in your office letter No 1503 dated 19-6-29, 28-29 or if there is any difficulty, what is the Rs an interpellation on the subject is coming up before the Legislative Assembly, detailed information as to how the matter stands at present will be useful and is requested.

Yrs sincerely

18.9.30

Just 19/9/30.

Immediate.

D.O 1503

Mucl. 27-8

25.9.30

15/482 Muz
26-9-30

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE

Bangalore, 25th Sept. 1930

Dear Mr. Subrahmanya Sastry,

In reply to your D.O. letter No.657/Muz. dated 18th 1930 re mohatarfa revenue of the inam portion of Thirthahalli town, I write to inform you that the Deputy Commissioner's proposal to appoint a committee was received in this office on 14th April 1928. While the matter was under consideration Financial Secretary's letter No.2010/Muz.dated 7th May 1928 was received and the Deputy Commissioner was thereupon ---- requested to furnish the additional information called for by Government. In the meanwhile, the late Muzrai Commissioner (Mr. P. G. D'Souza) personally discussed the matter with the Vice President and some of the members of the Municipal ---- Council and the result was communicated to Government in this office letter of the 19th June 1929. The resolution of the Municipal Council referred to in the above has not yet been received. At a meeting held on 29th May 1930 the council resolved that "as the nature, extent and boundaries of the Inam endowed to Sri Rameswara are not known the same may be obtained from the Inam office for the settlement of this ---

Continuation is on the R.A Session

17) (29)

Interpellation No. 26 by Mr. Thudaki Ramanna & others.

R.A. Dasara Session October 1930.

Dno 635 Nov 11, '30

Interpellation	Draft reply.
(a) Are the Government aware of the Muzrai portion being included in the Municipal area in the town of Thirthahalli?	Yes.
(b) Is this Muzrai portion measured and fixed?	Measured and fixed by the District Surveyor. The matter has been referred to the Inam Superintendent to furnish details about the nature, extent and boundaries of the Inam portion of the Thirthahalli town.
(c) What is the income from this portion of the town?	Jamabandi - Mohatarfa Rs. 1694/- Professional tax Rs. 485-15-0
(d) To what funds is this credited?	Three-fourths of Mohatarfa tax collected goes to the temple while one-fourth goes to the Municipality. Professional tax is entirely credited to the Municipality.
(e) Are the Government aware of the fact that the Muzrai-Municipal controversy resulted in the gradual decrease in the Municipal income?	Government have no information.
(f) How long are the Municipal Councillors and others requesting the Government to pass final orders in the matter?	Since January 1927, when the Dewan toured in the Shimoga District.
(g) What is the total amount collected on the Muzrai portion of the town after the passing of the G O. abolishing the Mohatarfa on the Inam lands.	Rs. 3,313-12-0
(h) What is the amount credited to the Municipal funds out of the above amount?	Rs. 836-0-0
(i) Is any amount paid towards the repairs in the Municipality out of the collections credited to Muzrai Funds?	Vide answer to question (d)

VS

P.J.D.

18

Messrs Tudki Ramanna Gowda, H Srinivasa Naik, and **B. Gopalachar,** Tirthahalli Taluk —

Q —**29** Will the Government be pleased to state —

(*a*) Whether the Government are aware of the Muzrai portion being included in the Municipal area in the town of Tirthahalli?

(*b*) Whether this Muzrai portion is measured and fixed?

(*c*) What is the income from this portion of the Town?

(*d*) To what funds is this credited?

(*e*) Whether the Government are aware of the fact that the Muzrai—Municipal controversy has resulted in the gradual decrease in the Municipal income?

(*f*) How long the Municipal Councillors and others are requesting the Government to pass final order in the matter?

(*g*) What is the total amount collected on the Muzrai portion of the town after the passing of the Governmnet order abolishing the mohatarfa on the inam lands?

(*h*) What is the amount credited to the Municipal funds out of the above amount?

(*i*) Whether any amount is paid towards the repairs in the Municipality out of the collections credited to Muzrai funds?

Secretary to Government, General Departments.—

A —**29** (*a*) Yes

(*b*) Measured and fixed by the District Surveyor The matter has been referred to the Inam Superintendent to furnish details about the nature, extent and boundaries of the Inam portion of the Thirthahalli town.

(*c*) Jamabandi-Mohatarfa Rs 1694—0—0
Professional tax Rs 465—15—0

(*d*) Three-fourths of Mohatarfa tax collected goes to the temple while one-fourth goes to the Municipality Professional tax is entirely credited to the Municipality

(*e*) Government have no information.

(*f*) Since January 1927, when the Dewan toured in the Shimoga District

(*g*) Rs 3,313-12—0

(*h*) Rs 836—0—0

(*i*) *Vide* answer to Part (*d*)

M C 13]

No. C C/[illegible] 3/ — and duplicate copies of translation

GENL & REV SECTT. 596 28. NOV 1932 MUZRAT

19

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAT COMMISSIONER

Dated, Bangalore, ... 193..

26 NOV 1932 SECTT

FROM

S HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ, MA, BL, [illegible]
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

To

[illegible]
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore
[illegible] *Department.*

SIR,

2. In duplicate [illegible]

21)

/ [illegible] Rs.500/- [illegible] Temple [illegible] Thirthamalli [illegible] Court [illegible] Thirthahalli [illegible] Municipality [illegible] Taluk.

With reference to your Memo No.C.408 of 30-31 dated the 12th --- October 1932 calling for a report in the matter of the settlement of the dispute between the Thirthahalli Municipality and Sri Ramesvara Temple Trustees over the honor to invite your kind reference to my Memo. No.C.293/27-28 dated the 25th April 1932 forwarding a copy of my letter to the General Secretary to Government together with a copy of the decisions arrived at, the joint meeting of the Dharmadarsis and some of the Municipal Councillors held on 13th April 1932, when it was resolved that the Municipality should buy up the rights of the temple over the Inam villages with the aid of a loan to be obtained from Government by the Municipality at a favourable rate of interest. The Dharmadarsis that were present at this meeting were agreeable to sell the Inam lands to the Municipality and quoted Rs.xxx Rs.16,000/- as their price while the Municipal Councillors are not --- agreeable to give more than Rs.10,000/- by way of compensation to the -- temple

2. The question of compensation to be paid was referred to both the -- Municipality and the Dharmadarsis for their opinion and I enclose copies of the resolutions of the Municipal Council and the Dharmadarsis passed at their subsequent meetings for your information. It will be seen from the resolutions of the Dharmadarsis, that they have finally agreed to accept Rs 15,000/- subject to the condition that the quota due to them out of the Nomaturfa collections from 1328 up to the date of the acquisition should be paid to them, that the sale amount might be treated as a loan to the Municipality carrying interest at 6% and repayable in instalments of not less than Rs.1000/- at a time. The Municipality have agreed to these conditions. Since both the Municipality and the Dharmadarsis have come to an understanding, the Inam land belonging to the temple at Padavam alli will soon [illegible] major portion of the Thirthahalli town is to be acquired by the Municipality subject to the following ------ conditions -

(i) [illegible] Rs.15,000/- [illegible] Rs.10,000/- [illegible] temple.

(ii) [illegible] Municipality [illegible] Rs.1000/- [illegible] 30 years

(iii) [illegible]

...s regards the question of the payment
...ohatarfa collections from 1928, I invite your
this office letter No.Ju/.1.3.293/27-28 dated 5th Apl.
addressed to you by Mr. P T. Kesavaiengar, the then Deputy
Sioner in which, he has opined that the Government order No.207
5005/L.B 26-56-163 dated 27th February 1928 abolishing the levy
of Mohatarfa in all villages in the State does not apply to the
town of Thirthahalli which had already been constituted into a
Municipality by Government in the order of 1918 and that under
the arrangement arrived at, in the compromise effected by Sir V.P.
Madhava Rao the temple is entitled to recover its quota of the
Mohatarfa dues even after the issue of the Government (order) of 1928
as it is in the nature of a contract between the temple authorities
and the Municipality and ratified by Government. The contention
of the Municipality that the Inamdar is not entitled to the Mohatarfa
collections after the Government Order of 1928 does not seem to
me to be tenable and will have to be decided against the Municipality.

4. I think the best terms have been offered to the Municipality
for, if the Municipality do not purchase the Inamdars' rights, its
resources can not be improved and the Municipality will have to be --
abolished in which event the Inamdar Temple will also lose its right
to collect the Mohatarfa taxes under the order of 1928. I therefore
request that early orders may be obtained to the above proposals to
bring this longstanding dispute to an end.

5. Necessary acquisition proceedings will be taken on receipt of
Government Orders

"C o p y"

Navaneeth

For Huzra Commissioner.

23)

Proceedings of the joint Meeting of the Dharmadarsis of the Sri Mareswara temple and the Municipal Councellors held in the -- Middle School Hall this day at 3 P.M.

President - M. G. Mehkri Esq., B.A., LL.B.,

Deputy Commissioner,

~~President~~ -
Present —

Mr. R. Thammaji Rao, B.A., LL.B., Assistant Commissioner.

" M.L. Narasimhaiyya B.A., District Survey Officer.

" H.S. Venkatappa Gowda, Vice President Municipal Council.

" B. Gopalachar, Municipal Councellor and Dharmadarsi

" K. Dakappa, Municipal councilor

" L. D'souza do

" T. Ramanna Gowda do

" H. Hanumantha Naik, Municipal Councellor.

" N. C. Ananthakrishnamachar, Medical Probationer.

" K. V. Sreenivasamurthi B.E.,

" Udupi Ramachar, Dharmadarsi.

After a long discussion, it was resolved:-

(1) That the title deed showing the nature of inam granted to the Mareswara temple in the Padavanahalli village may be obtained for the mouncipal Council to decide the temple rights.

(2) Further resolved that it would be most desirable to settle the matter amicably and to this end it was decided that it would be advantageous to buy up the rights of the temple, if any, by the municipality.

(3) Resolved that as ~~xxxx~~ some of the Municipal Councellors and Dharmadarsis are absent, another Meeting be held in the 1st week of January'32 during the jatra to discuss the matter further to ~~xxxx~~ arrive at a settlement.

(Sd.) M.G. Mehkri,
Deputy Commissioner.

"C o n d"

for Mamlat Commissioner.

[illegible]

26)

[illegible] 30 9 1932

[illegible]

× × × × × ×

[illegible] 16000 [illegible] 2.9.1932 [illegible] 20.9.32 [illegible]

[illegible] 30-4-932 [illegible] 15000 [illegible]

[illegible]

"Extract"

(Sd) Narasimha Rao
President

"Copy"

[illegible]

for Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆ/ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ/1928/32

ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೃಷಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರವೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಯಸುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಸಿ. ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಾನವಾದ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು, ಕೃಷಿ ಕಾಲೇಜು, ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 15.9.32 ರೊಳಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. (ಪಕ್ಷ) ಅಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಥವಾ ತಡವಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯು 20.9.32 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಲಿದೆ. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ
25.8.32

ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಾ.ಆ.ಇ./ಟೆಂಡರ್/1928/32

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೊಹರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಟೆಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಟೆಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್, ಸಾ.ಆ.ಇ. ವಿಭಾಗ, ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 30.9.32 ರೊಳಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಚೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೃ.ಇ./ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ/1928/32

ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೃಷಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರವೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಯಸುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಸಿ. ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಾನವಾದ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು, ಕೃಷಿ ಕಾಲೇಜು, ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 15.9.32 ರೊಳಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. (ಪಕ್ಷ) ಅಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಥವಾ ತಡವಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯು 20.9.32 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಲಿದೆ. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ
25.8.32

ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಾ.ಆ.ಇ./ಟೆಂಡರ್/1928/32

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೊಹರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಟೆಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಟೆಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್, ಸಾ.ಆ.ಇ. ವಿಭಾಗ, ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 30.9.32 ರೊಳಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಚೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೃ.ಇ./ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ/1928/32

ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೃಷಿ ಕಾಲೇಜಿಗೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ರವೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಯಸುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಸಿ. ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಾನವಾದ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು, ಕೃಷಿ ಕಾಲೇಜು, ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 15.9.32 ರೊಳಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. (ಪಕ್ಷ) ಅಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಥವಾ ತಡವಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯು 20.9.32 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಕಾಲೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಲಿದೆ. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಹಾಜರಾಗಬೇಕು.

ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ
25.8.32

ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಾ.ಆ.ಇ./ಟೆಂಡರ್/1928/32

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೊಹರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಟೆಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಟೆಂಡರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್, ಸಾ.ಆ.ಇ. ವಿಭಾಗ, ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳ ಇವರಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ 30.9.32 ರೊಳಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಷರತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಚೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬಹುದು.

ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್

98)

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
(waive) [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

15000/- [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1000/-
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 900
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

(Sd) [illegible]
" [illegible]
" [illegible]
" [illegible]
" [illegible]

"Copy" [signature]
for Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District

[illegible]
[illegible] 18.7.28 29)

× × × × × × ×

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] No. 2010 [illegible] 7 5 1928 [illegible]
(GO No 4973-5005 dB 26-26 - 163 [illegible] 27.2.1928 [illegible] ([illegible]) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] No. 5026 dB 26-26-164 [illegible] 26-2-28 [illegible]

× × × × ×

[illegible]

30

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

× × ×

(Sd) B Gopala Char
Dt 4 6.32 — Chairman.

"Copy"

[illegible]
Deputy Commissioner,
— Kurnool District.

1931 [illegible] 18 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 31)

[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
〃 [illegible]	〃 [illegible]
〃 [illegible]	
〃 [illegible]	
〃 [illegible]	

[illegible]	[illegible]
(1) [illegible]	1894 [illegible] 1918 [illegible]

[illegible]

37

[illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1894 [illegible]

[illegible] 1918 [illegible]

[illegible] 1981 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] "

(Sd) [illegible]

" [illegible]

" [illegible]

" [illegible]

" [illegible]

"COPY" [signature]

For Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

33)

Proceedings of the joint meeting of the Dharmadarsis of the Sri Rameswara Swamy temple and the municipal councillors of the Nirkahal Municipality held in the Municipal Council hall this day at 4 P.M. (3-4-32)

Presided:

M.G Mehta Esq BA, LLB, Deputy Commissioner, Kanara District

Present:

1 Mr K M Narasimhaiah, BA District Survey Officer
2 " K Vedantaiengar, BA, Amildar
3 " K. Ramakrishna Bhatta, Dharmadarsi & municipal councillor
4 " B Gopalachar -do- do-
5 " Katte Dakappa municipal councillor,
6 " H S Venkatappa Gowda municipal vice President
7 " Balagar Hasansab municipal councillor
8 " H Srinivasa naika -do-
9 " Lawrence D'Souza -do-
10 " Indaki Ramannagowda -do-
11 " Javali Raghupathi Rao -do-
12 " Gujjar Ramakrishnappa Dharmadarsi
13 " Nayak Ramachar -do-
14 " NC Anantakrishnama Charlu medical Subscriber
15 " Narayana Iyengar Assistant Engineer

1 The municipal councillors present

P.T.O

accept, after the verification of the survey records,
3) the Survey Officer, that 76 acres and 3 gunters belonging
to Padavanakkadu Village are those endowed to
the Sri Rameswara temple on which a major portion
of Nirthakadi town is now built

2 The municipal councillors are in favour
of continuing the municipality and wish to bring up
the Maundars' rights over the above extents

3. The municipal councillors, desire that in order
to bring up the above rights of the Maundars, Govern-
ment be approached to advance the required
amount to the municipality as a loan, on a
favourable rate of interest to be repaid in
annual instalments with interest

4 The Maundarwars are of opinion, that the
amount of Compensation fixed by me Rs Kodawadyeppa
is reasonable viz - Rs 16,000 and may be
paid to the temple

5 The municipal Councillors, on the other
hand, think that no more than Rs 10,000/-
can be paid owing to the Colombo resources
at their Command.

(Sd) M G. Mehtri,
President

"Correct"
for Deputy Commissioner
Distt of Batticaloa

[illegible]

35

[illegible] 30.4.1932

[illegible] 5

[illegible] 293/1928 [illegible] 23.4.32 [illegible]

[illegible] 15,000 [illegible]

(1) 1928 [illegible]

2 - 1928 [illegible]

[illegible]

36)

[illegible] [redacted]

[illegible]

15000/- [illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible] 15000/- [illegible]

[illegible]

(Sd) S Narasimhaiah

[illegible]

"Copy"

For Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪಿಡಿಒ/ಕಾ.ಇ.ಯೋ/ಕೆ.ಎಲ್.ಪಿ.ಎಸ್/ 176 /2021-22 ದಿನಾಂಕ: 21/08/2021

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿದ ಪಿಡಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪಿಡಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಯಿಂದ ಸನ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಸಹಕರಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ.	ಹೆಸರು	ಹುದ್ದೆ
1	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
2	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
3	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
4	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
5	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
6	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
7	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
8	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು
ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪಿಡಿಒ/ಕಾ.ಇ.ಯೋ/ಕೆ.ಎಲ್.ಪಿ.ಎಸ್/ 176 /2021-22 ದಿನಾಂಕ: 21/08/2021

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿದ ಪಿಡಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪಿಡಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಯಿಂದ ಸನ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಸಹಕರಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ.	ಹೆಸರು	ಹುದ್ದೆ
1	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
2	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
3	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
4	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
5	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
6	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
7	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
8	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು
ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಪಿಡಿಒ/ಕಾ.ಇ.ಯೋ/ಕೆ.ಎಲ್.ಪಿ.ಎಸ್/ 176 /2021-22 ದಿನಾಂಕ: 21/08/2021

ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿದ ಪಿಡಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪಿಡಿಒ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಸೇವೆಯಿಂದ ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಯಿಂದ ಸನ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಸಹಕರಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ.	ಹೆಸರು	ಹುದ್ದೆ
1	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
2	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
3	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
4	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
5	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
6	ಶ್ರೀ. ಎಂ.ಎಸ್.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
7	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಪಿಡಿಒ
8	ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ.ಎಂ.ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನ	ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು
ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿ

38)

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬರೆದುಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಇವರುಗಳು ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಇವರುಗಳು ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಇವರುಗಳು ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಇವರುಗಳು ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಇವರುಗಳು ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಇವರುಗಳು ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಇವರುಗಳು ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

39)

15,000/- [illegible]
[illegible]

1(a) [illegible]
[illegible] (normal) [illegible]
[illegible] 1894 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1500/- [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1500/- [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 16000/- [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 16000/- [illegible]
6% [illegible]
16000/- [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] 500/-
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

(2) 1928 में बी.ए.

मालवा प्रान्तीय हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन
द्वारा संचालित हिन्दी विद्यापीठ
इन्दौर

परीक्षा-फल

सन् १९२३ ई० की जनवरी में होने वाली
विशारद परीक्षा में सम्मिलित हुए परीक्षार्थियों
में से जिन्होंने उत्तीर्ण होने के लिये आवश्यक
अंक प्राप्त किये हैं उनके नाम, रोल नम्बर
तथा प्राप्त अंक नीचे दिये जाते हैं।

जिन परीक्षार्थियों ने प्रथम श्रेणी में उत्तीर्ण होने
के लिये आवश्यक अंक प्राप्त किये हैं उनके नाम
के आगे (प्र) लिखा है। जिन्होंने द्वितीय श्रेणी
में उत्तीर्ण होने के लिये आवश्यक अंक प्राप्त
किये हैं उनके नाम के आगे (द्वि) लिखा है।
जिन्होंने तृतीय श्रेणी में उत्तीर्ण होने के लिये
आवश्यक अंक प्राप्त किये हैं उनके नाम के
आगे (तृ) लिखा है।

जिन परीक्षार्थियों के नाम के आगे कोई
श्रेणी नहीं लिखी है वे अनुत्तीर्ण हुए हैं।

जिन परीक्षार्थियों के नाम के आगे (अ)
लिखा है उनके अंक अपूर्ण

41)

[illegible] 30 40 [illegible]

ಅನುಬಂಧ-೧೦

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ/ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ/ಶಿಸ್ತು/೨೦೨೩/೧೪೭೨

ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೦೩.೦೪.೨೦೨೩

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ಬಿ.ಎಸ್.,
ಚಾಲಕ ಕಂ ನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ,
ಘಟಕ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೧೨,
ಕೆಂಪೇಗೌಡ ನಗರ ಡಿಪೋ.

ವಿಷಯ: ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಲೋಪ ಮತ್ತು ಅಶಿಸ್ತಿನ ವರ್ತನೆಗಾಗಿ ಜ್ಞಾಪನಾ ಪತ್ರ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ, ನೀವು ದಿನಾಂಕ ೨೮.೦೨.೨೦೨೩ರಂದು ಮಾರ್ಗ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೩೪ಎ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯಾಣಿಕರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಅಸಭ್ಯವಾಗಿ ವರ್ತಿಸಿದ್ದಲ್ಲದೆ, ಟಿಕೆಟ್ ಕೇಳಿದ ಮಹಿಳಾ ಪ್ರಯಾಣಿಕರೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಅವಾಚ್ಯ ಶಬ್ದಗಳಿಂದ ನಿಂದಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಲಿಖಿತ ದೂರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟೀಕರಣ ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ, ನೀವು ಮೌಖಿಕವಾಗಿ ಕ್ಷಮೆಯಾಚಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ, ಲಿಖಿತ ಉತ್ತರ ನೀಡಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸಿರುವುದು ಗಂಭೀರ ಲೋಪವಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಚಾಲಕ ಕಂ ನಿರ್ವಾಹಕರಿಂದ ಸಭ್ಯತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಂಯಮವನ್ನು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಜ್ಞಾಪನಾ ಪತ್ರ ತಲುಪಿದ ೭ ದಿನಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಲಿಖಿತ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟೀಕರಣ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ನಿಗದಿತ ಅವಧಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಾರದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ (ಶಿಸ್ತು ಮತ್ತು ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, ೧೯೮೫ರ ಅನ್ವಯ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/-
ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮೂರ್ತಿ
ಘಟಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾಪಕರು
ಕೆಂಪೇಗೌಡ ನಗರ ಡಿಪೋ

ಪ್ರತಿ:
೧. ಶ್ರೀ ಮಂಜುನಾಥ ಬಿ.ಎಸ್., ಚಾಲಕ ಕಂ ನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ
೨. ಸಂಚಾರ ಅಧೀಕ್ಷಕರು, ಕೆಂಪೇಗೌಡ ನಗರ ಡಿಪೋ
೩. ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಕಡತ

43)

[illegible]

[illegible]

16000/ [illegible]

[illegible]

Sd. B Gopalachar

Sd. [illegible]

Sd Y Varappa.

Sd. [illegible]

19.6.32 Sd B Gopalachar.
Chairman of the meeting.

"Copy"

[signature]

For Deputy Commissioner
[illegible] District

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಪಶು ಕೃ ಸಂ ಇಲಾಖೆ/ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ/ಕಾಯ್ದೆ/01

ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಕಾಯ್ದೆ ಕಲಂ 10 ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಕಾಯ್ದೆ ಕಲಂ 10 ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕದಿಂದ 7 ದಿನಗಳೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಲಿಖಿತವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯ ವಿವರಗಳು:-

(1) ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಥಳ :- ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ, ಕಾಡುಮನೆ

ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 93/ಬಿ ಪಿ 28 ಆರ್ 28832

ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯ ಕಟ್ಟಡವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಪಾವತಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯ ಕಟ್ಟಡವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಪಾವತಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

(2) ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಡುವ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳು :- ಕಾಡುಮನೆ, ಕೆರೆಮನೆ, ಹೊಸಮನೆ, ಬೆಟ್ಟದಮನೆ, ಕಾಡುಮನೆ ಕಾಲೋನಿ, ಕೆರೆಮನೆ ಕಾಲೋನಿ, ಹೊಸಮನೆ ಕಾಲೋನಿ, ಬೆಟ್ಟದಮನೆ ಕಾಲೋನಿ.

ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು
ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಕಾಡುಮನೆ

ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು
ಪಶು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಕಾಡುಮನೆ

ದಿನಾಂಕ 2-9-1932

ಸೂಚನೆ: ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ 1932 ನೇ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ 9 ರೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಲಿಖಿತವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿದೆ.

[redacted]

"COPY"

Dated Narasaraopet the
Dtd.7.32.

"COPY"

Addl. Dy. Commissioner,
Sherlopa-District.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT

46)

Section ml

File No

Serial No /

No L 6229

Diary No of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 25/3/33

Signed by Mr A S Rao

To

The Dy Com. Shencottah

Sir—

With reference to your letter No Mutt I C 293/32-28 Dt 31.10.1932 to the Murrai Commissioner regarding the settlement of the dispute between the Thirumalai Mts & Sri Rameswaraswamy temple in respect of the appropriation of the revenue from Mohatarfa collected in the Inam patties of the Thirumalai Zamin, I am directed to state that the copies of resolutions sent with your letter do not show that the Municipal Council of Thirumalai have agreed

over

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 02327—GPB—5 000—15 4 30

While Confirming that the sum of Rs 15,000 to be treated as a loan will be repaid in instalments of not less than Rs 1000 at a time, the whole amount being repayable within 30 years I am therefore enquire if there is a resolution of the Municipal Council agreeing to these conditions, and whether they are also agreeable to the instalments being made a first charge on the revenues of the municipality. It may also be stated if the proposals made as regards the amount of instalments and the period of repayment are accepted by the Dharmadarsi of the Temple.

A very early reply is requested

Yours

Sd/ [illegible] 3/33.

Sec' Secy to Govt

and whether their financial condition admits of the payment of interest on the loan & the instalments

Dufamation may also be given as to the intervals at which the loan instalments are to be paid and as to the time manner of payment of interest, whether annually or bi

Memo No L.6280

Copy to the Municipal Council for information with reference their letter C-4087/30-31 dt 24-11-32

DO

Sec' Secy

Extra

L.6225

22nd March
25th

45

The

The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District.

With reference to your letter No.Muz.1.C.293/27-28 dated 31st October 1932 to the Muzrai Commissioner regarding the settlement of the dispute between the Thirthahalli Municipality and Sri Rameswaraswami temple in respect of the appropriation of the revenue from mohatarfa collected in the Inam pattam portion of the Thirthahalli town, I am directed to state that the copies of the resolutions sent with your letter do not show that the Municipal Council of Thirthahalli have agreed to the condition that the sum of Rs.15,000 to be treated as a loan will be repaid in instalments of not less than Rs.1000 at a time, the whole amount being repayable within 30 years. I am therefore to enquire if there is a resolution of the Municipal Council agreeing to these conditions, whether they are also agreeable to the instalments being made a first charge on the revenues of the Municipality and whether their financial condition admits of the regular payment of interest on the loan and the instalments thereof. It may also be stated if the proposals made as regards the amount of instalments and the period of repayment are accepted by the Dharmadarsis of the temple. Information may also be furnished as to the intervals at which the loan instalments are to be paid and as to the time of payment of interest, whether annually or otherwise.

A very early reply is requested.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd. R.Ranga Rao.
General Secretary to Government.

mk.3

p.t.o.

Memo No. L.6280 Dated, Bangalore, the 25th March 1933.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Musrai Commissioner in Mysore with reference to his letter No.d. 408/30-31 dated 24th November 1932.

By order,

for General Secretary to Government.

Mr 31-30-60

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
SHIMOGA DISTRICT

No Mz 1 C 293/27-28
Encs three.

Dated, Shimoga, July 12, 1933

311

FROM

T V A ISVARAN, ESQ, BA,
Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District

GEN'L & REV SEC.
14 JULY
L. & G. BRANCH

To
THE SECRETARY
S.N. APPANY IYENGAR, ESQ., B.A, B.L,
General Secretary to Government,
BANGALORE.

GENERAL SECRETARY
14 JULY 1933
No. L.S.

SIR,

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. L 6229 dated 22/25th March 1933 and in continuation of this office letter No Mz 1 C 293/27-28 dated 4-7-1933 regarding the dispute between the Thirthahalli Municipality and Sri Rameswara temple in respect of the appropriation of the revenue from Mohatarfa collected on buildings in the inam portion of the town, I have the honour to state as follows -

The Municipal council have resolved on 28-5-1933 that the sum of Rs 15,000/- will be paid in a span of 30 years in instalments of not less than Rs 1,000/- at a time and that this amount might be the first charge on the revenues of the Municipality

They have also further resolved on 30-6-1933 that their financial position would be improved as a result of the settlement of the dispute, as mohatarfa on the inam portion would in its entirety go to the Municipality and the arrears outstanding recovered easily, that they would pay the instalment of Rs 1,000/- once in two years and the interest at the end of May every year

The Dharmadarsis of the temple have resolved on 7-7-1933 that they have agreed to the resolutions of the municipal council dated 30-6-1933

Copies of the three resolutions are sent herewith for perusal

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

12/7/33
Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District

IGR

తీర్మానము 1933 నవంబరు, మే, తారీఖు 28వ్వ భూమువాళ మున్సాబ్‌ను - పెద్దింబోగు - తిరుపతి - తల్లూరు పిటిషను నిమిత్తం - తిరుచానూరు - పుత్తవారి మునిసిపలు హౌస్‌లో రవరు చేయనది - ఈ తీర్మానం మీద చొంగ ప్రెసిడెంట్స్ -

51)

x x x x x x x x x

తీర్మానము 2

తిరుచానూరు - చదల్ - శ్రీరామేశ్వరదేవ స్థానం విషయం - చిత్తూరుదల్లి 15.000 రూ, స్థలం కొనవలసి వచ్చినందువలన 1.000 రూ. మేరా మిగతా స్థలం - తిరుగుబడి చట్టంకి - ఎదురుగా 1000 రూ, గోడ కట్టించడం కోసం రూపాయలు ఇవ్వడం - మరియు మిగిలిన మేరా స్థలం - 3000 రూపాయలకి - తిరుగుబడి చేయడం - హౌస్‌లో తీర్మానం ఆగస్టు 1-4-33 రవల్ల డి.ఓ.ఎ. నం. తో ఇవ్వడం జరిగింది

తీర్మానము

15.000, రూపాయిగళ్ళను పంచరుళ్ళ గళ్ళ అవధిలోల్లి - తిరుగుబడి చట్టంకి, 1000 రూ - కడిమి ఇల్లదంతే - రంగు వందరంతే - మోవరి మూడు లేక్కి చేంతే లూ - యిదన్ను బిట్టిన ప్రదము జనవరి అంయిగిదవంతే పట్టి - తీర్మానిసిద లాయితు

"Extract"

President
Thirthahalli Municipal Council

ది 1-6 33

53)

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ/ಭೂಸ್ವಾ/293/2015-16

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 29.3.2016

ಸೇವೆಗೆ,

ಶ್ರೀ. ಅಬ್ದುಲ್ ಸತ್ತಾರ್ ತಂದೆ ಲೇಟ್ ಅಬ್ದುಲ್ ಖಾದರ್
ಸಾ|| ಮಾಗಡಿ ಟೌನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹೋಬಳಿ
ರಾಮನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ

ವಿಷಯ: ಭೂಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮೊತ್ತ ಪಾವತಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: ಮಾಗಡಿ ಟೌನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹೋಬಳಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 6 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 2 ಎಕರೆ 00 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ರೂ. 15,000/- ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ನೀವು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮನವಿ ಪತ್ರ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 29.3.2016.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ತಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮಾಗಡಿ ಟೌನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹೋಬಳಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 6 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 2 ಎಕರೆ 00 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ರೂ. 15,000/- ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ನೀವು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮನವಿ ಪತ್ರ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 29.3.2016.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ತಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಮಾಗಡಿ ಟೌನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಹೋಬಳಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 6 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 2 ಎಕರೆ 00 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ರೂ. 15,000/- ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಬಿಡುಗಡೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಪಾವತಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ನೀವು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮನವಿ ಪತ್ರ ದಿನಾಂಕ: 29.3.2016.

"Copy"

Treasurer

Deputy Comm

53)

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ/ಭೂಸ್ವಾ/ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ/293/2018-19

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 06.12.2018

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಕೊಪ್ಪಳ ತಾಲೂಕಿನ ಹಿರೇಸಿಂದೋಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 7 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0.36 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಧನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಪರಿಹಾರ ಧನವು ಎಕರೆಗೆ ರೂ. 15,000/- ಗಳಂತೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ರೂ. 5,400/- ಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಧನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಪರಿಹಾರ ಧನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಪರಿಹಾರ ಧನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ. ಪರಿಹಾರ ಧನವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

"Copy"

Treasurer

Deputy Comm

ಉಪ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT. . . . . 2 diffs

54)

Section mc
File No 31-30
Serial No 61

Diary No of letter replied to

No L. 949

To

The D C. Chittoor Dt.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 31/7/33

Signed by Alla A. Subba Rao

Sir,

With reference to your letter no Mms. 1C 293/27-28 dt 12/7/33 regarding the dispute between the Thirthakaramu and Sri Rameswara temple in respect of the appropriation of the revenue from Mohatarfa Collection on buildings in the transportation of the town, I am directed to request you to forward for reference a statement showing the annual income of the Municipality and its annual expenditure for the past 5 years, including items of expenditure on essential services such as scavenging and lighting of the town.

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32

5)

(2) As it is not understood how the present recommendation of the MC to pay an annual interest of Rs 900/- at 6 p.c. on Rs 15,000/-, and also a sum of Rs 1,000/- towards principal biennially would be possible, I am to request you to kindly go into the matter in further detail and submit a clear report, after duly considering the exact financial implications of the proposal, as the present financial position of the MC can by no means be said to be good

I have &c

27/7 2 copies

27/7 for Gen Secy

L 950/ens 31/7/33 MB

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Huzrat Camp in Mysore for information in continuation of this Office no L-6280 dy 25 3-33, with a copy of letter no Hus IC 293/27-28 dy 12 7 33 of the Dy Com, Shimoga referred to above

B.O

Sec'y

extra copy

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 28th July 1933.

No L. 949/rel 31-30-61

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District,
Shimoga.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.Miz.1C.293/27-28 dated 18th July 1933 regarding the dispute between the Thirthahalli Municipality and Sri Rameswara temple in respect of the appropriation of the revenue from Mohatarfa collection on buildings in the Inam portion of the town, I am directed to request you to forward for reference a statement showing the annual income of the Municipality and its annual expenditure, for the past 5 years, including items of expenditure on essential services such as scavenging and lighting of the town.

As it is not understood how the present recommendation of the Municipality to pay an annual interest of Rs.900 at 6 per cent on Rs.15,000 and also a sum of Rs.1,000, towards principal biennially would be possible, I am to request you to kindly go into the matter in fuller detail and submit a clear report, after duly considering the exact financial implications of the proposal, as the present financial position of the Municipal Council can by no means be said to be good.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd. S.N.Appannaiengar,
General Secretary to Government.

P.T.O.

T33

57

Memo No. L 950

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Mmzrai Commissioner in Mysore for information in continuation of this office No.L.6280 dated 25th March 1933, with a copy of letter No.Mnz.1.C.293/27-28 dated 18th July 1933 of the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga referred to above.

By Order.

For General Secretary to Government.

TSS.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT 2 drafts 58

Section mc
File No 31-30
Serial No 62

Diary No of letter replied to

No L. 951

To the Mufrai Commr

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Sir,

With reference to your letter no C 408/30-31 dt 24-11-32 addressed to the Hd Sy to Govt regarding the transfer of the Mohotarpa revenue in the Inam portion of Thirthahalli to the local Municipality town it has been stated that the Sri Rameswara swamy temple should give up all its rights over the Inam portion of the town. I am to enquire whether this means surrender of interest in the lands also.

I have &c

for 2/11/32 for gen Secy

Date of issue 31/7/33

Signed by Mr A Subba Rao

2 copies

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32

extra copy

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

59

No L 951/Rel 31-30-62 Dated, Bangalore, 31st July 1933.

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner
in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In your letter No.C.408/30-31 dated 24th November 1932 - addressed to the Financial Secretary to Government regarding the transfer of the mohatarfa revenue in the Inam portion of Thirthahalli town to the local Municipality, it has been stated that the Sri Rameswaraswami temple should give up all its rights over the Inam portion of the town. I am to enquire whether this means surrender of interest in the lands also.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Asubba Rao
For General Secretary to Govemment.

mb

Tss.

Ml 31-30-63

No Mur2-C.293 Gne 33
1927-28

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
SHIMOGA DISTRICT.

Dated, Shimoga 18th December 1933

2999

FROM

T. V. A. Isvaran, Esq, B. A.,
~~Mohadin Mehkri, Esq, B.A., LL.B.~~,
Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

To

H. V. Ramaswami, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
General Secretary to Government.
Bangalore.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.L.949/Ml.31-30-61 dated 31st July 1933 and subsequent reminders thereto calling for a detailed report re: the dispute between the Tirthahalli Municipality in respect of the appropriation of the revenue from Mohatarfa collection in the inam portion of the town, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of the note of the Sub Division Officer, Shimoga, on the financial position of the Municipality and also a copy of the statement showing its annual income and expenditure for the past 5 years including the items of expenditure on essential services such as Scavening and lighting of the town

I think that the temple, while giving up all its rights over the inam portions, should surrender all its interests also in the inam portion.

In this connection, a reply has been sent to the Muzrai Commissioner on 11th December 1933 as called for in his Memo No.408/30-31 dated 22-8-33 forwarding a copy of your letter No.L.951/M.31-30-62 dated 31st July 1933.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

61)

A note on the Municipal Muzrai Controversy at Tirthahalli.

FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE MUNICIPALITY.

-

An examination of the figures of income and expenditure of the Municipality furnished by the President for five years shows an average income of Rs 10,334/- and an average expenditure of Rs 9,990/-. An examination of details shows that there have been fluctuations under each head every year. To avoid any possible risk of inaccuracy, it is safer not to take these figures as the normal income and expenditure of the Municipality for calculating its future financial position. In the current year's budget all exaggerations of income are omitted, and unnecessary expenditure avoided. It, therefore, shows the highest possible receipts and the lowest possible expenditure The following figures are therefore adopted for normal income and expenditure for future calculations:-

Present income.		Income expected after the settlement of dispute.
Octroi	5700	5700/-
Taxes on buildings and lands and professional taxes.	768	2686 (This includes the receipts from the Muzrai portion of the town Viz., Rs 1918/-.
Special acts.	150/-	150/-
Taxes on Vehicles	12/-	12/-
Revenue from Municipal Property excluding interest on investments.	336/-	336/-
Total	Rs 6966/-	8884/-

N.B.

A sum of Rs 2,650/- is omitted here as it represents in the budget the probable arrears to be recovered during 33-34 and another sum of Rs 200/- is also omitted as it represents

deposits

(67)

deposits etc., under public Debt head which does not form part of normal income of the Municipality.

If the interest accuring on the investments of the Municipality is added on to the above income, it comes to Rs 7,700/- (income as at present) or Rs 9,218 (income expected after the settlement of the dispute). Hence the net increase in any case is Rs 1918/-.

E X P E N D I T U R E:-

The budget provision for 33-34 is Rs 9,403. In this provision, Rs 1000/- has been made for original works and Rs 700/- under Public Debt head which includes re-payment of depcsits etc. These two items will have to be deducted as they do not form part of the necessary expenditure of the Municipality. So the minimum indispensible expenditure is Rs 7,703/- his includes Rs 600/- for lighting and Rs 2189/- for conservancy and sanitation. This provision is stated to be sufficient to meet the requirements of the Municipality in the Muzrai portion also as heretofore.

The net working balance at the credit of the Municipality will be:-

	A.	B
Income	9218 which includes interest on investments.	8884 which excludes interest on investments.
Expenditure.	7703	7703
Balance.	Rs 1515	1181

Even taken at the lowest, the Municipality will have Rs 1000/- at its credit at the end of every year.

MODE OF PAYMENT OF Rs 15,000/- WITH INTEREST @ 6%.

There are two methods of paying this amount:-

i) A sum of Rs 5,000/- invested by the Municipality in 6% State Loan Bonds can be immediately paid up as the first instalment.

instalment. The debt will then reduce itself to Rs 10,000/- and correspondingly the interest of Rs 900/- will reduce of itself to Rs 600/-. The balance of debt of Rs 10,000/- with interest at 6% can be discharged by the Municipality by proper regulation and control of expenditure in a period of 10 years by annual instalments of Rs 1,000/- each. The interest on this debt also goes on decreasing every year according as the principal gets paid annually.

ii) A Second Mehtod of payment could be by paying Rs 15,000/- by annual instalments of Rs 1,000/- with interest each spread over a period of 15 years.

In either of these two cases the period of 30 years agreed upon must remain in force to make a provision for any financial difficulty - which the Municipality may getinto. If the debt is regularly paid within this period, it is so much the better for both sides.

It is also ascertained during my enquiry that immediately after this thorny question is settled the accumulated arrears of Rs 4569 will be easily collected. There is every probability of realising this hope. Further an increase is also expected from the revision of the taxes on buildings and lands which have remained the same ever since the constitution of this Municipality.

I had a talk with the Municipal Councillors and the Dharmadarsis on the 23rd and the 30th of this month and they are agreeable to the proposals submitted by me above Whichever of these proposals seems feasible may be adopted.

30th November 1933. Sd/- A. S. Khaleel,
Sub Division Officer,

"Copy"

P Ramiah

Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

Statement showing the expenditure in the Thirthahalli Municipality for the past 5 years from 1928-1929 to 1932-33.

Expenditure	1928-29			1929-30			1930-31			1931-32			1932-33		
Municipal Office Establishment	500	4	.	569	7	10	319 ~~297~~	2 ~~13~~	11 ~~5~~	297	13	5	228	15	11
Travelling allowance	9	4	.	20	.	.	-	.	.	19	14	10	.	.	.
Contingencies	25	13	9	23	3	9	33	13	.	.	.	.	11	10	6
Furniture	24	8		.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Stationery	18	13	9	.	.	.	.	.	.	16	4	.	5		
Miscellaneous	16	10	.	19	.	.	38	8		2	.		.		
Salary of octroi Establishment	1171	5	9	1226	9	5	1130	2	4	1276	15	9	670	4	8
Octroi Contingencies	179	8	7	69	5	6	.	.	.	58	9	3	53	13	.
Pensionary contribution	250	1	4	303	1	11	284	11	.	246	6	1	146	7	4
other Charges for public safety	33	8	.	19	12	.	40	9	6	67	9	.	90	2	5
Purchase and Repairs of Hh. Lantern	148	5	.	219	.	9	220	4		.	.	.	.	.	.
Lighting by Contract.	775	2	.	720	9		620	4	.	542	14	6	549	5	9
Reward for destruction of wild animals	6	14	6	-	8	.	.	.	.	.	4	.	2	4	.
Total Establishment	2582	-	2	2723	8	9	2722	12	9	2067	5	8	1878	2	10

Repairs	454	-	-	848	14	-	420	-	-	8	13	-	586	-	-				
Refund and Deposit.	752	6	9	291	14	-	120	-	-	1057	14	-	2911	4	8				
Town Improvement grant.																			
Revetment to the side drain at S.M. Road.	920	8	-	589	-	-	200	-	-	399	-	-	-	-	-				
Country medicines				54	5	8													
Refreshment-charges at Meetings.				34	-	6	20	-	6										
Payment of Mowrai Mohatarfa Advance.							359	9	-										
							15	-	-	10	-	-	75	-	-				



Sd/- Srarasimha Rao, Shimoga
Resident—
Shikaripur Municipality—
10 11 33

18 12 1933.

R. Ramachandra
Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District

~~bution~~ for the L. 7. Dispensary	442	-	-	589	-	-	628	-	-	622	8	-	414	-	-			
ubution for repairing the L 7 Dispensary	41	-	-	36	10	8	50	-	-	110	-	10	8	33	5	4		
~~tribution to the Veterinary Hospital~~	552	3	-	141	-	-	.	.	.	-	-	-	-	186	-	-		
ccination Charges	12	12	-	13	12	-	-	-	-	18	12	-	9	8	-			
ld charges. --	4	8	4	8	4	-	4	2	8	4	2	8	-	-	-			
rden Establishment	115	2	11	129	15	9	126	12	6	124	1	2	132	-	-			
eading charges	29	2	8	22	11	8	20	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-			
Fairs and Festivals	37	12	-	34			46	12	-	44	14	-	56	4	-			
Contribution for Taluk Conference	15	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-			
Primary Education Contribution	204	-	-	204	-	-	269	-	-	204	-	-	-	-				
High School rent	300	-	-	300	-	-	300	-	-	300	-	-	300	-				
Contribution for Reading Room	100	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	-			
Contribution for District Conference	10	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-									
Audit charges.	24	10	-	31	15	-	32	-	-	-	-	-		-	-			
Law charges	14	-	-	74	14	-	199	12	-	385	12	-	56	4	-			
Charitable Institutions & other Charges	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			25	-	-			
Original works	616	14		473	-	-	400	-	-	564	-	-	382	8	-			
													P.T.O.					

Mc 31-30-64 3348 L. (6)

M C 13]

No 408/30-31 Revd 14

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

Dated, Bangalore, 10th *January* 1934

FROM

N. Madhava Rau, Esq., P.A., B.L.,
~~S. HIRIANNAIYA, Esq., M.A., B.L.~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

GEN & REV SECT. 13 JAN 1934 L.G.D. Mysore

To

GENERAL SECRETARY 11 JAN 1934 No. L.951

H. V. Ramaswamy, Esq., M.A., P.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
General *Department*

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.L.951/Ml.31-30-62 dated 31-7-33 enquiring whether giving up of the rights of Sri Ramadevaru temple at Tirthahalli over the inam portion of the town means surrender of interest in the lands also, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of letter No.Muz.1.C.293/27-28 dated 9-12-33 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, together with the enclosures stating that the temple, while giving up all its rights over the inam portion, should surrender all its interests also in the inam portion and to state that I agree with the view of the Deputy Commissioner.

2. In this connection, I invite kind reference to the Sub Division Officer's alternative proposals as regards the mode of payment of the amount agreed upon by the Municipality. The first alternative under which a sum of Rs.5000/- in the shape of 6½% loan bonds can be immediately paid and the balance of Rs 10,000/- can be spread over only 10 years would be a satisfactory arrangement and may be favourably considered.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

N. Madhava Rau

Muzrai Commissioner

67)

Letter No.Muz.1.C.293/27-28 dated 9-12-33 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

---

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No.408/30-31 dated 22-8-33 forwarding for furnishing the required information copy of letter No.L 951/M 31-30-62 dated 31-7-33 from the General Secretary to Government regarding the transfer of Mohatarfa revenue in the inam portion of the Tirthahalli Town to the local municipality, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the note of the Sub Division Officer, Shimoga, on the financial position of the Municipality and a copy of the statement showing its annual income and expenditure for the past 5 years including the items of expenditure on essential services such as scavenging and lighting of the town.

I think that the temple while giving up all its rights over the inam portion should surrender all its interests also in the inam portion.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner

posits etc,under public debt head which does not -

norral incore of the Municipality.

If the interest accruing on the investments of the municipality

Note on the Municipal Muzrai controversy at Thirthahalli.

Financial Position of the Municipality.

An examination of the figures of income and expenditure of the municipality furnished by the President for five years shows an average income of Rs 10,334 and an average expenditure of Rs 9990/ An examination of details shows that there have been fluctuations under each head every year. To avoid any possible risk of inaccuracy, it is safer not to take these figures as the normal income and expenditure of the municipality for calculating its future financial position. In the current year's budget all exaggerations of income are omitted and unnecessary expenditure avoided. It, therefore, shows the highest possible receipts and the lowest possible expenditure. The following figures are, therefore, adopted for normal income and expenditure for future calculations.

Present income.		Income expected after the settlement of dispute	
Octroi	5700.	5700	
Taxes on buildings and lands and professional taxes.	768	2886	(This includes the receipts from the Muzrai portion of the town, viz. Rs 1918/
Special acts.	150.	150.	
Taxes on vehicles	12.	12	
Revenue from Municipal property excluding interest on investments.	336.	336	
Total.	Rs 6966.	8884.	

N.B.- A sum of Rs 2650/- is omitted here as it represents in the budget the probable arrears to be recovered during 1933-34 and another sum of Rs 200/- is also omitted as it represents deposits etc, under public debt head which does not form part of normal income of the Municipality.

If the interest accruing on the investments of the municipality

(4)

municipality (~~on the investments of the municipality~~) is [redacted]
the above income, it comes to Rs 7,300 (income as at present) [redacted]
Rs 9,218 (income expected after the settlement of the dispute). [redacted]
the net ~~income~~ increase in any case is Rs 1918/-

Expenditure:-

The budget provision for 1933-34 is Rs 9,403. In this provis[illegible] Rs 1000/- has been made for original works and Rs 700/- under public [illegible] head which includes repayment of deposits etc. These two items will have to be deducted as they do not form part of the necessary expenditure of the Municipality. So the minimum indispensible expenditure Rs 7703. This includes Rs 600/- for lighting and Rs 2189/- for conserv[illegible] and sanitation. This provision is stated to be sufficient to meet t requirements of the municipality in the Muzrai portion also as heret

The net working balance at the ~~xxxxxx~~ credit of the Municipality will be:-

	A.	B.
Income.	9218 which includes interest on investments.	8884-which excludes interest on investm
Expenditure:-	7703.	7703.
Balance.	1515.	1181.

Even taken at the lowest, the municipality will have Rs 1000/- at its credit at the end of every year.

Mode of payment of Rs 15,000 with interest at Rs 6/-.

There are two methods of paying this amount:-

1)z A sum of Rs 5000/- invested by the Municipality in 6½ % State Loan Bonds can be immediately paid up as the first instalment. The debt will then reduce itself to Rs 10,000 and correspondingly the inter of Rs 900/- will reduce itself to Rs 600/-. The balance of debt of Rs 10 with interest at 6% can be discharged by the municipality by proper re gulation and control of expenditure in a period of 10-years by annual instalments of Rs 1000/- each. The interest on this debt also goes on

70)

on decreasing every year according as the principal gets paid annually.

2). A second method of payment could be by paying Rs 15,000/- by annual instalments of Rs 1,000/- with interest each spread over a period of 15-years.

In either of these two cases the period of 30-years agreed upon must remain in force to make a provision for any financial difficulty which the municipality may get into. If the debt is regularly paid within this period, it is so much the better for both sides.

It is also ascertained during my enquiry that immediately after this thorny question is settled, the accumulated arrears of Rs 4569/- will be easily collected. There is every probability of realising this hope. Further an increase is also expected from the revision of the taxes on buildings and lands which have remained the same ever since the constitution of this municipality.

I had a talk with the Municipal Councillors and the Dharmadarsis on the 23rd and the 30th of this month and they are agreeable to the proposals submitted by me above. Whichever of these proposals seems feasable, may be adopted.

For Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

v.s.r.
11 xii 33.

RR

Proceedings of the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

M231-30-65

Read:-

G.O.No.18646-7/L.F. 161-92 dated 3rd May 1894 directing that from 1st July 1894, Sri Rameswara Temple of Tirthahalli be allowed three-fourths of the mohatarfa collected in the inam portion of the Municipality and the ~~other one-fourth~~ balance credited to the Municipality

2. Correspondence ending with letter No.Muz.~~1~~ C 293/27-28 dated 18th December 1933 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District regarding the proposal of the Tirthahalli Municipal Council to buy up the rights of Sri Rameswara Temple over the inam portion of the Municipality for Rs15,000 and the manner of payment of this sum to the temple.

3 Correspondence ending with letter No.408/30-31 dated 10th January 1934 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore on the subject

---

Order No. Le 1462-6/31-30-65/Rev

Dated, Bangalore, 28th April 1934

The ~~present~~ town of Tirthahalli is comprises ~~made up~~ of Padavanahalli and two other villages. The temple of Sri Rameswara at Tirthahalli as the inamdar of Padavanahalli ~~and had~~ has been in full enjoyment of the mohatarfa revenue in addition to the benefits from the inam lands of the village. With the growth of population in the town and of trade and other activities since the year 1880 odd, the need for municipal organisation was felt and a municipality

was formed. As the mohatarfa collections were being appropriated by the temple, the Municipality levied a separate tax called "Kachara terage" for meeting the ~~increasing demand in respect of~~ expenditure on sanitation and conservancy. The residents of the town ~~having resented~~ objected to this double taxation, and Government in their order of 1894 read above approved of the abolition of "Kachara Terige" ~~in the Tirthahalli Municipality~~ and directed that the temple be allowed three-fourths of the mohatarfa collected in the inam portion of the ~~Municipality~~ Town and that the other one-fourth be credited to the Municipality for ~~the said purpose~~ meeting that expenditure The Municipality ~~was~~ Can be duly however ~~contending~~ that the whole of the mohatarfa ~~should go to it.~~ rightly belongs to Shimoga

2 In G O No.L 4973-5005/L.B 26-26-163 dated 27th February 1928, the levy of mohatarfa ~~taxes~~ was abolished in all the villages in the State and the Muzrai Commissioner was asked to report ~~what~~ the income which the temple derived from this source and how the loss to the temple should be made good After ~~discussion of the question~~ consulting on the spot and correspondence ~~with~~ the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga, the Muzrai Commissioner reported in his letter No.C.408/30-31 dated 24th November 1933 that the Municipal Council had resolved to buy up the rights and interests of the temple in the inam portion of the town on payment of a compensation of Rs15,000, which should be treated as a loan to the Municipality by the temple and that repayable ~~at~~ carrying 6% interest in annual instalments. ~~and that~~ The Dharmadarsis of the temple were ~~also~~ for such reasonable agreeable to the proposal, ~~and recommended~~ and it was submitted by the Muzrai Commissioner ~~for sanction thereto.~~ On enquiry as to the time

Dharmadarsis of temple have given their consent, as they consider it to God for Kachara

73)

and manner of payment of the said sum of Rs 15,000 by the Municipality and the acceptance by the temple of the terms proposed by the latter, the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District has, in consultation with the Municipal Councillors and the Dharmadarsis of the temple, submitted for the sanction of Governmen the following proposals which have been agreed to by the Huzrai Commissioner:-

of the loan

(i) Immediate payment by the Municipality to the temple of a sum of Rs 5,000 out of its investment in 6½% State Loan Bonds, ~~as the 1st instalment~~, and

(ii) the payment of the balance of Rs 10,000 in 10 annual instalments of Rs 1000 each ~~years~~ with interest at 6% per annum.

3. Government are pleased to approve of the proposal agreed ~~upon~~ between the Authorities Temple and the Municipality for the payment by the latter to the former of a sum of Rs 15,000 as ~~suitable~~ compensation for its giving up all its rights and interests over the Inam portion of the town. The proposals made for payment of the loan amount are also approved.

The Huzrai Comr is requested to arrange for the execution of a final agreement between the temple and the Municipality embodying the terms referred to above. The draft of the agreement may be got prepared in consultation with the Govt Advocate

4. The Comptroller is requested to take steps to transfer at their present market value the 6½% State Loan Bonds at the credit of the Municipality to the ~~name of~~ Sri Ramaswara Temple, Tirthahalli, towards the payment of the first instalment of the amount payable by the Municipality. The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, should arrange for the Municipality, making due provision for the payment of the second and subsequent instalments and interest to the temple in its annual budgets. The amount of equated annual payment on this account may be ascertained from the Comptroller

improving its revenue resources and

5 The Inam Superintendent is requested to effect needful alterations in the Inam Register pertaining to the Inam Village in question.

Secy. to Government,
Development Deptt.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore with records
The Comptroller to Government of Mysore
The Superintendent, Revenue Survey and Settlement in Mysore

Copy to Muzrai Branches.

psk.

S. O.

Government of his highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS

G O No L 1462 6—Ml 31 30 65, dated 28th August 1934

Proposal of the Tirthahalli Municipal Council to buy up the rights of Sri Rameswara Temple

Passes orders regarding the —— over the Inam portion of the Municipality

READ—

Government Order No 18646 7—L F 161 92, dated 3rd May 1894, directing that from 1st July 1894, Sri Rameswara Temple of Tirthahalli be allowed three fourths of the mohatarfa collected in the Inam portion of the Municipality and the balance credited to the Municipality

2 Correspondence ending with letter No Muz C 293—27 28 dated 18th December 1933, from the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga District regarding the proposal of the Tirthahalli Municipal Council to buy up the rights of Sri Rameswara Temple over the Inam portion of the Municipality for Rs 15 000 and the manner of payment of this sum to the temple

3 Correspondence ending with letter No 408—30 31, dated 10th January 1934 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, on the subject

ORDER No L 1462-6—Ml 31-30-65, DATED BANGALORE, THE 28TH AUGUST 1934

The town of Tirthahalli is composed of Padavanahalli and two other villages As the inamdar of Padavanahalli, the temple of Sri Rameswara at Tirthahalli had been in full enjoyment of the mohatarfa revenue in addition to the benefits which it derived from the Inam lands of the village since the year 1880 With the increase of population in the town and of trade and other activities, the need for a municipal organisation was felt and a Municipality was formed As the mohatarfa collections were being appropriated by the temple, the Municipality levied a separate tax called "Kachara Terige" for meeting the expenditure on sanitation and conservancy The residents of the town objected to this double taxation, and Government in their order of 1894, read above, approved of the abolition of "Kachara Terige" and directed that the temple be allowed three-fourths of the mohatarfa collected in the Inam portion of the town and that the other one-fourth be credited to the Municipality for meeting its expenditure The Municipality contended however that it should receive the whole of the mohatarfa revenue

2 In Government Order No L 4973-5005—L B 26-26-163, dated 27th February 1928, the levy of mohatarfa was abolished in all the villages in the State and the Muzrai Commissioner was asked to report the income which the temple derived from this source and how the loss to the temple should be made good After consulting the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga, the Muzrai Commissioner reported in his letter No C 408—30 31, dated 24th November 1933, that the Municipal Council had resolved to buy up the rights and interests of the temple in the Inam portion of the town on payment of a compensation of Rs 15,000, which should be treated as a loan to the Municipality by the temple, carrying six per cent interest, and repayable in annual instalments

The Dharmadarsis of the temple having agreed to the proposal, the Muzrai Commissioner submitted it to Government for sanction

3 In regard to repayment of the loan, the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, has, in consultation with the Municipal Councillors and the Dharmadarsis of the temple, submitted for the sanction of Government the following proposals which have been agreed to by the Muzrai Commissioner —

(i) Immediate payment by the Municipality to the temple of a sum of Rs 5 000 out of its investment in 6½ per cent State Loan Bonds, and

(ii) the payment of the balance of Rs 10 000 in ten annual instalments of Rs 1,000 each with interest at 6 per cent per annum

No L 1462-6—Ml 31-30-65, dated 28th August 1934

4 Government are pleased to approve of the proposal agreed to by the temple authorities and the Municipality for the payment by the latter to the former of a sum of Rs 15,000 as compensation for its giving up all its rights and interests over the Inam portion of the town The proposals made for payment of the loan are also approved

The Muzrai Commissioner is requested to arrange for the execution of a formal agreement between the temple and the Municipality embodying the terms referred to above The draft of the agreement may be got prepared in consultation with the Government Advocate

5 The Comptroller is requested to take steps to transfer at their present market value the 6¼ per cent State Loan Bonds at the credit of the Municipality to the Sri Rameswara Temple, Tirthahalli, towards the payment of the first instalment of the amount payable by the Municipality The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, should arrange for the Municipality improving its revenue resources and making due provision for the payment of the second and subsequent instalments and interest to the temple in its annual budgets The amount of equated annual payment on this account may be ascertained from the Comptroller

6 The Inam Superintendent is requested to effect needful alterations in the Inam Register pertaining to the Inam Village in question

M VENKATANARANAPPA,
Secretary to Government,
Development Department

To—The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore
The Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District
The Comptroller to Government of Mysore
The Director of Land Records, Survey and Settlement in Mysore
The Government Advocate

Exd—C K

WD 397—GPB- 335—8 9 34

Note: Pages 1-45

Correspondence Pages 1-76